LONGINUS

ON THE SUBLIME

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY
W. HAMILTON FYFE

REVISED BY
DONALD RUSSELL

INTRODUCTION

Date and authorship

Both date and authorship of this famous and important book remain a matter of controversy. The only evidence for the author's name is given by the conflicting statements of the tenth-century manuscript (Parisinus 2036, hereafter P) on which alone our text depends. P has, in the title, *Διονυσίου Λογγίνου*; in the table of contents, *Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου*. Which represents ancient tradition? If the *ἢ* ("or") is original, and its omission in the title an accident, we clearly have two guesses at the author, presumably by Byzantine scholars: he was either the Augustan Dionysius of Halicarnassus or the third-century Cassius Longinus, a pupil of Plotinus, but a scholar and statesman rather than a philosopher. Neither guess is at all probable. Dionysius' numerous works are quite different from our book in style and in general approach. It is true that both he and our author (39.1) wrote on word arrangement (*σύνθεσις*), but Dionysius' treatise is in one book, and our author says he has written two.

Cassius Longinus has been a much more popular choice; indeed, this identification was undisputed until the early nineteenth century, and the lofty tone of *On the Sublime* was seen as the natural reflection of the heroic

temper of the minister of Queen Zenobia, who was put to death after the fall of Palmyra in A.D. 273 (Gibbon, ch. xi). Moreover, there are actually some overlaps between *On the Sublime* and the fragments of Cassius Longinus' rhetorical treatise (conveniently printed in A. O. Prickard's edition of *On the Sublime*, Oxford 1906, as in many early editions); and the eleventh-century rhetorician John of Sicily (*Rhetores graeci* 6.211, 6.225 Walz) actually refers to Longinus' Φιλόλογοι ὁμιλίαι for opinions which coincide with points made in *On the Sublime* 3.1 and 9.9 (see now G. Mazzucchi, *Aevum* 64 (1990) 153–63). But there is no reason why any of this should be taken as proving Longinian authorship. Indeed there are even differences in the details of style and language, which surely make identification impossible: to take a small but notable matter, *On the Sublime* regularly has πάντες ἑξῆς for "absolutely all," whereas Longinus has ἐφεξῆς in the same idiom (Russell, 1964, xxv n.1). There are powerful arguments also in matters of content. In *On the Sublime*, no writer later than Cicero, Caecilius, and Theodorus is named; the real Longinus—if these fragmentary texts are to be trusted—spoke favourably of Aelius Aristides. Again, our author is an admirer of Plato, and much of his argument is directed to defending Plato against unappreciative critics like Caecilius; Longinus himself seems to have criticized Plato's "poetic" style in terms very like those of our author's opponents (R 7–10, S 23–25 Prickard).

The principal argument against Cassius Longinus is also a general argument against any date later than about A.D. 100, namely that derived from the closing chapter (44). Here, a "philosopher" presents the view that the

"decline" of oratory is due to the loss of free speech and political liberty, while the author represents himself as countering this by attributing the decline to a moral collapse rather than external circumstances. There are indeed a lot of ambiguities and difficulties in this little dialogue; it is not easy to be sure whether the author is thinking of the contrast between the free cities of Greece in the age of Demosthenes and their subsequent subjection to Macedon and later to Rome, or of the contrast between Cicero's republican liberty and the principate of Augustus and his successors. The setting and tone of the book, however, suggest that it is primarily this second set of circumstances that is meant. After all, the addressee, Postumius Terentianus, is a young Roman of some standing; and our author is prepared to venture an opinion about Cicero. It is all relevant to Rome. But if this is so, parallels in other authors—the two Senecas, Tacitus, Pliny—strongly suggest a date in the first century A.D. It is harder to be more precise. Good arguments have been advanced for an Augustan date (G. P. Goold, *American Journal of Philology* 92 (1961) 168–192), the age of Tiberius (H. Selb, "Probleme der Schrift περὶ ὕψους" diss. Heidelberg 1957), and the end of the century (e.g. K. Heldmann, *Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst*, Munich 1982, 286–293, making the book a response to Tacitus' *Dialogus*). The third-century date still has advocates (G. W. Williams, *Change and Decline*, Berkeley 1978, 17–25; G. Luck, *Arctos* 5 (1967) 97–113; and, tentatively, G. M. A. Grube, *Greek and Roman Critics*, Toronto 1965, 340–352), but the case is not strong.

So what are we to call the author? He is either anony-

mous, the Great Unknown, or, if we assume that the title of P has authority, he is Dionysius Longinus; the name is not impossible after all. It is tantalizing that his addressee, Postumius Terentianus, cannot be identified; he *may*, of course, be the Terentianus who served in Egypt A.D. 85/6 (Martial 1.86), or the man whose name is on a lead water pipe of the second century (*C.I.L.* XV.2.7373). But who these people were, and what circle they moved in, are less important questions than what the book says, and what place it holds in the history of criticism.

Analysis

Analysis of the treatise is rendered difficult by the damage which P has suffered; there are six long lacunae, and something missing at the end. We have lost about a third of the book. Nevertheless, we can see the author's plan clearly enough, except in one important respect, the treatment given to πάθος. We can also see that some of his central theses are presented not in the course of the argument as he advertises it in chapter 8, but in the eloquent and powerful digressions. He is a sophisticated artist, both in his style and in his economy. This has always been recognized. Pope's famous remark (*Essay on Criticism* 675–680) that he is "himself the great sublime he draws" has antecedents in the earliest period of Longinian criticism: Francesco Porto (1569) says of him: "non solum docet sed etiam rapit, et quodammodo vim affert lectoribus"—exactly what "Longinus" says himself of the writers he admires.

Let us set out the analysis as far as we can.

1–2: A formal preface, in which Caecilius of Caleacte (a friend of Dionysius, it seems: *ad Pompeium* 3) is criticized, Terentianus flattered, the subject defined, and the objection that ὕψος is a matter of nature, not art, raised and answered.

3–5: Following the first lacuna, we find ourselves in the midst of a discussion of faults consequent on inadequate or misconceived attempts to achieve sublimity: turgidity, frigid conceits, inappropriate emotiveness. This helps to define the subject by contrast.

6–7: A positive account of the true sublime follows, but in very general terms. It is something which stands repeated reading, and makes a powerful and lasting impression on readers of different backgrounds. It will endure.

8: There are five sources of sublimity: (i) great thoughts (9–15); (ii) strong emotion—something Caecilius left out; (iii) certain figures of thought and speech (16–29); (iv) noble diction (30–38, 43); (v) dignified word arrangement (39–42).

But where is emotion (ii) discussed? This is the problem that has most exercised critics; see, for a good discussion, J. Bompaire, *REG* 86 (1973) 323–343. We are told at the very end (44.12) that πάθη are to be the subject of a special treatment to follow next; on the other hand, there are many references throughout the book to emotion, seen as an integral element in sublimity, and associated with all the other four sources. The safest conclusion is that some explanation of this procedure was given in the long passage lost following 9.4.

(i)

9.1–4: Beginning of the discussion of great thoughts.

9.5–15: Homer's greatness of thought, with a remark (9.9) on the beginning of *Genesis*, seen as a worthy representation of the divine, and a comparison (9.11–15) of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

10: Selection and accumulation of detail as a means to sublimity; including an analysis of a poem by Sappho (φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος . . .)

12.4–13.1: Following the lacuna, we find the author still discussing amplification, with a comparison between Cicero and Demosthenes, and an example of Plato's art of combining abundance with sublimity.

13.2–14: The mention of Plato raises the question of imitation as a means of attaining sublimity, since Plato drew on Homer, and we should draw on, and try to think like, the great men of the past.

15: *Phantasia*—visualization or imagination—as a means to sublimity; the difference between rhetorical and poetical visualization.

(iii)

16–17: General introduction to the discussion of figures (16–29), including a detailed examination of the Marathon oath in Demosthenes (*de corona* 208), and advice on concealing one's ingenuity, so as not to be suspected of trickery: the best concealment is sublimity and emotion.

18: Rhetorical questions. A lacuna follows.

19: Asyndeton.

20–21: Anaphora and asyndeton.

22: Hyperbaton, including a detailed analysis of a passage in Herodotus.

23–24: Polyptoton, singular for plural, plural for singular.
25: Historic present.
26–27: Vivid second person; abrupt introduction of direct speech.
28–29: Periphrasis.
29.2: Summary, emphasizing again the close links between emotion and sublimity.
(iv)
30: Introduction to the section on language. A lacuna follows.
31: The discussion is now about metaphor, and especially vivid and idiomatic examples.
32: Criticism of Caecilius' rule that one should not use more than two or three metaphors on any one theme: examples from Demosthenes, Xenophon, and Plato's *Timaeus*. Caecilius' criticism of Plato and excessive enthusiasm for Lysias are seen to be motivated by contentiousness.
33–35: A "digression," to which Wilamowitz gave the title *Regel und Genie*. (It is the most eloquent part of the book, and central to its message.) Genius, even when it makes mistakes, is preferable to impeccable mediocrity. Mechanical criticism would prefer Hyperides to Demosthenes, and we see this to be absurd; the gap between Plato and Lysias is infinitely wider. Our admiration goes to the greatest works of nature, not to mere prettiness, and hence also to the products of natural genius, which all ages admire.
37: Beginning of a discussion of similes. A lacuna follows.
38: Hyperbole.

(v)

39–42: Word arrangement: examples of the ways in which rhythm is decisive in producing sublime effects, and common words can be given grandeur by skilful placing. Dangers of excessive rhythmization and brevity.

43.1–5: seems to belong under "choice of words" not under "arrangement." We have a lengthy discussion of a passage of Theopompus, in which the effect of a grand situation is marred by the intrusion of commonplace words and details.

43.6: In general, the opposites of the devices that produce sublimity will produce its opposite, lowness of style.

44.1–11: The deeper causes of failure are examined in a dialogue, in which an unnamed philosopher makes the case that it is loss of liberty that produces the current dearth of lofty writing, and the author attributes it rather to moral decline.

44.12: Transition to the promised discussion of πάθη, broken off short in our text.

A little about the background

"The appearance of this unknown Greek . . . has something miraculous about it." Ernst Curtius (*Latin Literature and the European Middle Ages*, 399 [E.T.]), in company with many, exaggerates. It is Longinus' eloquence, and the fact that no similar work survives, that have led people to think him more mysterious than he really is. In fact he represents a tradition.

The basic division between grand and ordinary styles goes back a long way in Greek thinking: the ἀγών

between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs* is a classical expression of the contrast. Indeed, later rhetoricians even found it in Homer, who contrasts Menelaus' rapid, clear speech with Odysseus' "winter snows" (*Iliad* 3.214). A third manner—the smoothness of Isocrates, or the honeyed words of Nestor (*Iliad* 1.243)—was, it seems, added later; and the resulting three-style theory is canonical in Cicero, Quintilian, and much later criticism. This development is not really relevant to Longinus, who is concerned only to identify the characteristics that mark out the emotionally intense and elevated from the merely pleasing and soothing. Nor is it precisely a style—a χαρακτήρ or *genus dicendi*—that is his subject: this is better described as a tone of writing, attainable only as a consequence of a developed intellectual and emotional response to life. This is not to say that his ὕψος is conceptually unique in ancient criticism; but it resembles not so much the *genera dicendi* as what Dionysius calls "additional virtues" (*epithetoi aretai*), the possession of which lends a particular character to writers who already possess the "necessary virtues" of purity, clarity, and brevity. Even closer, perhaps, are certain of the *ideai*—forms or tones of speech—identified by the second-century rhetor Hermogenes and others of the same period. According to Hermogenes, all these *ideai* could be found in Demosthenes; but once detected and isolated, they could become patterns for imitation. Among these *ideai* were σεμνότης and σφοδρότης, solemnity and vehemence; and these, and others like them, were sharply opposed to the *ideai* of charm and delicacy, in a general contrast very like that which Longinus draws between Hyperides and Demosthenes. (The

translation of Hermogenes by Cecil Wooten, Chapel Hill, 1988, may be consulted to form a notion of this theory and its implications.) But not even in Hermogenes is there so detailed, comprehensive, and enthusiastic a discussion of the high tone as in our treatise. Moreover, it is sharply distinguished from anything Hermogenes wrote by its firm moral basis. For Hermogenes, anyone could choose to write grandly if he selected his subject appropriately and followed the suggestions laid down about vocabulary, figures, sentence structure, and rhythm; for our author, it is only possible if you really develop your intellect and your emotions, by the study of the classics, to the point when high thoughts and their due expression come more or less instinctively to mind. This kind of attitude is quite common in the imperial period, and seems to have appealed especially to Romans. It is primarily a response on the part of teachers of rhetoric to accusations made by philosophers that their art was amoral, and could be used indifferently for good or bad ends. Longinus' warm defence of Plato against Caecilius (and indeed Dionysius) and his assignment of the moral argument in chapter 44 to himself rather than to any philosopher point in the same direction; he wishes to commend himself to Terentianus not only as a technical teacher but as a guide to right attitudes in life. Only thus can his concern with Homer and classical poetry and his insistence on the need to look to posterity be seen to be "useful to public men," *ἀνδράσι πολιτικοῖς χρήσιμον*, as he puts it in the preface (1.2).

Influence

Parisinus 2036 was copied for Bessarion in 1468, and at least once again later in the century. Other copies of these copies were also made, and Latin translations circulated in manuscript before the first printed editions (1554–5) and printed Latin translations (1566, 1572). But the work made little impact on the literary world at large until much later. The Italian translation of Niccolo da Falgano (1560) remained in manuscript; the first published English version is by John Hall (1652). All was changed in 1674 by Boileau's *Traité du sublime ou du merveilleux dans le discours, traduit du grec de Longin.* This made "Longinus" a central text in European criticism throughout the eighteenth century. In England, its influence was first advanced by John Dennis' *Advancement and Reformation of Poetry* (1701), and *Grounds of Criticism in Poetry* (1704). No doubt the book's moral stance was congenial to a thinker who regarded religion and "enthusiastic passion" as the natural subjects of poetry. But Dryden and Addison were also familiar with it, Sir Joshua Reynolds' *Discourses on Painting* adapt many of its ideas, Gibbon and Dr. Johnson both admired it, and Burke at least used it as a starting point of speculation, though the main contentions of *The Sublime and the Beautiful* go far beyond Longinus' scope. This eighteenth-century admiration faded with the coming of Romanticism, when that liberty of thought and comparative freedom from rule which Longinus authorized came to be taken for granted and no longer needed special defence. The eloquence of the book, however, has always continued to earn it enthusiastic readers and a wide

response; the wealth of learned work on its text and interpretation, and the special place it always holds in histories of criticism, are testimony to its enduring significance.

Text

The text rests on Parisinus 2036 (P), supplemented by the apographa in two places where P was damaged after the primary copies were taken (viz. ὡς κἀν . . . ἠρκέσθην [8.1–9.4] and τὸ ἐπ' οὐρανόν . . . ἰδέσθαι [9.4–9.10]) and also by two miscellanies (Parisinus 985 and its copy Vaticanus 285) which alone preserve the "fragmentum Tollianum," viz. φύσις . . . θεωρίαν (2.3). Our brief and very selective apparatus mentions also (as "K marg.") some variants (conjectures, no doubt) in the margin of Cantabrigiensis KK.VI.34, a copy of Bessarion's copy, made by Francesco Porto, apparently in connection with the preparation of the Aldine edition of 1555.

Translation

This is a revision of W. Hamilton Fyfe's version, and I have tried not to tamper with it where it did not seem positively misleading. Thus I have left the poetical quotations for the most part as they were, though their style is now very dated, and made even more artificial by Fyfe's attempt to render Greek hexameters into English hexameters. I have also left some of Fyfe's notes, but have replaced or supplied others. The text and punctuation have also been revised.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The literature on *On the Sublime* is vast. Apart from the bibliographies in the principal editions (see below), there are bibliographies by D. S. Marin (*Bibliography of the Essay on The Sublime*, privately printed, 1967) and by D. Tavani (*La filologia recente di fronte al Peri Hypsous*, Rome 1971), and a survey article by G. Martano in *ANRW* II, 32.1 (1984), 364–403.

Of older editions, those of J. Toll (Utrecht 1694), J. Toup (Oxford 1778), B. Weiske (Leipzig 1809, Oxford 1820) are especially worth consulting. The fullest apparatus and list of conjectures is to be found in O. Jahn–J. Vahlen, *Dionysii Longini de sublimitate liber*, 4th ed. (1910), re-issued with index by H. D. Blume (1967).

The principal modern editions with commentary are those of W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1907; contains also a translation), D. A. Russell (Oxford 1964), and C. M. Mazzucchi (Milan 1992; especially useful for its study of the Renaissance tradition of the text). A. Rostagni's edition (Milan 1947) is also of importance.

Translations are innumerable. Boileau's was well edited by C.-H. Boudhors (Paris 1942). Contemporary English versions include those by G. M. A. Grube (New York 1957), T. S. Dorsch (in Penguin *Classical Literary Criticism* 1965), D. A. Russell (in *Ancient Literary Criticism*, Oxford 1972, and World's Classics *Classical Literary Criticism*, Oxford 1985). The version of W. Smith (London 1739) is a good example of an eighteenth-century rendering.

Brief general interpretations are to be found in most manuals of the history of criticism: e.g. G. M. A. Grube,

The Greek and Roman Critics, London 1965, 340–353; G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, Princeton 1972, 369–377; D. A. Russell in G. A. Kennedy (ed.), *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* i (1990) 306–311.

Other contributions to interpretation which should be specially noted are: W. Bühler, *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Schrift vom Erhabenen*, 1964; J. Bompaire, "Le pathos dans le traité du Sublime," *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 86 (1973) 323–343; D. A. Russell, "Longinus Revisited," *Mnemosyne* IV.34 (1981) 72–86; E. Matelli, "Struttura e Stile del περὶ ὕψους," *Aevum* 61 (1987) 137–207.

On Longinus' influence, see especially: S. H. Monk, *The Sublime*, New York 1935; M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, New York and London 1953; T. R. Henn, *Longinus and English Criticism*, Cambridge 1934; A. Rosenberg, *Longinus in England bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, diss. Berlin, 1917; J. Brody, *Boileau and Longinus*, Geneva 1958; K. Maurer, "Boileaus Uebersetzung" in *Le Classicisme à Rome*" (*Entretiens Hardt* XXV, 1979) 213–257.

ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ

1. Τὸ μὲν τοῦ Καικιλίου συγγραμμάτιον, ὃ περὶ ὕψους συνετάξατο, ἀνασκοπουμένοις ἡμῖν ὡς οἷσθα κοινῇ, Ποστούμιε Τερεντιανὲ[1] φίλτατε, ταπεινότερον ἐφάνη τῆς ὅλης ὑποθέσεως, καὶ ἥκιστα τῶν καιρίων ἐφαπτόμενον οὐ πολλήν τε ὠφέλειαν, ἧς μάλιστα δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι τὸν γράφοντα, περιποιοῦν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν, εἴγ'[2] ἐπὶ πάσης τεχνολογίας δυεῖν ἀπαιτουμένων, προτέρου μὲν τοῦ δεῖξαι τί τὸ ὑποκείμενον, δευτέρου δὲ τῇ τάξει, τῇ δυνάμει δὲ κυριωτέρου, πῶς ἂν ἡμῖν αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ δι' ὧντινων μεθόδων κτητὸν γένοιτο, ὅμως ὁ Καικίλιος ποῖον μέν τι ὑπάρχει τὸ ὑψηλὸν διὰ μυρίων ὅσων ὡς ἀγνοοῦσι πειρᾶται δεικνύναι, τὸ δὲ δι' ὅτου τρόπου τὰς ἑαυτῶν φύσεις προάγειν ἰσχύοιμεν ἂν εἰς ποσὴν μεγέθους ἐπίδοσιν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον παρέλι-
2 πεν· πλὴν ἴσως τουτονὶ μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα οὐχ οὕτως αἰτιᾶσθαι τῶν ἐκλελειμμένων ὡς αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπινοίας καὶ σπουδῆς ἄξιον ἐπαινεῖν. ἐπεὶ δ' ἐνεκελεύσω καὶ ἡμᾶς τι περὶ ὕψους πάντως εἰς σὴν ὑπομνηματίσα-

[1] Φλωρεντιανὲ P, corr. Manutius.
[2] εἴγ' Spengel: εἴτ'.

ON THE SUBLIME

1. You know, my dear Postumius Terentianus, that when we were studying together Caecilius'[a] little treatise on the Sublime it appeared to us to fall below the level of the subject and to fail to address the main points, or render its readers very much of that assistance which should be an author's chief aim, seeing that there are two requisites in every systematic treatise: the author must first define his subject, and secondly, though this is really more important, he must show us how and by what means we may reach the goal ourselves. Caecilius, however, endeavouring by a thousand instances to demonstrate the nature of the sublime, as though we know nothing about it, apparently thought it unnecessary to deal with the means by which we may be enabled to develop our natures to some degree of grandeur. Still, we ought perhaps rather to praise our author for the mere conception of such a treatise and the trouble spent upon it than to blame him for his omissions. But since you have now asked me in my turn to prepare some notes on the sublime for your own sake, let us then see whether my

[a] Caecilius of Caleacte in Sicily was a noted rhetorician and historian, contemporary with Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and said to have been a Jew. See E. Ofenloch, *Caecilii Fragmenta* (1907) for a full (but uncritical) collection of material.

σθαι χάριν, φέρε, εἴ τι δὴ δοκοῦμεν ἀνδράσι πολιτικοῖς τεθεωρηκέναι χρήσιμον ἐπισκεψώμεθα. αὐτὸς δ' ἡμῖν, ἑταῖρε, τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους, ὡς πέφυκας καὶ καθήκει, συνεπικρινεῖς ἀληθέστατα· εὖ γὰρ δὴ ὁ ἀποφηνάμενος, τί θεοῖς ὅμοιον ἔχομεν, "εὐεργεσίαν"
3 εἶπας "καὶ ἀλήθειαν." γράφων δὲ πρὸς σέ, φίλτατε, τὸν παιδείας ἐπιστήμονα, σχεδὸν ἀπήλλαγμαι καὶ τοῦ διὰ πλειόνων προϋποτίθεσθαι, ὡς ἀκρότης καὶ ἐξοχή τις λόγων ἐστὶ τὰ ὕψη, καὶ ποιητῶν τε οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ συγγραφέων οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἐνθένδε ποθὲν ἐπρώτευσαν καὶ ταῖς ἑαυτῶν περιέβαλον εὐ-
4 κλείαις τὸν αἰῶνα. οὐ γὰρ εἰς πειθὼ τοὺς ἀκροωμένους ἀλλ' εἰς ἔκστασιν ἄγει τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ· πάντη δέ γε σὺν ἐκπλήξει τοῦ πιθανοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸς χάριν ἀεὶ κρατεῖ τὸ θαυμάσιον, εἴγε τὸ μὲν πιθανὸν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ταῦτα δὲ δυναστείαν καὶ βίαν ἄμαχον προσφέροντα παντὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ἀκροωμένου καθίσταται· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς εὑρέσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων τάξιν καὶ οἰκονομίαν οὐκ ἐξ ἑνὸς οὐδ' ἐκ δυεῖν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὅλου τῶν λόγων ὕφους μόλις ἐκφαινομένην ὁρῶμεν, ὕψος δέ που καιρίως ἐξενεχθὲν τά τε πράγματα δίκην σκηπτοῦ πάντα διεφόρησεν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ῥήτορος εὐθὺς ἀθρόαν ἐνεδείξατο δύναμιν. ταῦτα γὰρ[1] οἶμαι καὶ τὰ παρα-

[1] δὲ Faber, perhaps rightly.

observations have any value for public speakers; and you yourself, my friend, will, I am sure, do what duty and your heart alike dictate and give me the benefit of your unbiased judgement in detail. For he spoke well who, in answer to the question, "What have we in common with the gods?" said "Beneficence and Truth."[a] Further, writing for a man of such education as yourself, dear friend, I almost feel freed from the need of a lengthy preface showing how the Sublime consists in a consummate excellence and distinction of language, and that this alone gave to the greatest poets and prose writers their preeminence and clothed them with immortal fame. For the effect of genius is not to persuade the audience but rather to transport them out of themselves. Invariably what inspires wonder, with its power of amazing us, always prevails over what is merely convincing and pleasing. For our persuasions are usually under our own control, while these things exercise an irresistible power and mastery, and get the better of every listener.[b] Again, experience in invention and the due disposal and marshalling of facts do not show themselves in one or two touches but emerge gradually from the whole tissue of the composition, while, on the other hand, a well-timed flash of sublimity shatters everything like a bolt of lightning and reveals the full

[a] This saying is attributed to Pythagoras (Aelian, *VH* 12.59) but also to Aristotle and Demosthenes and others (see *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, p. 25 Sternbach).

[b] A listener is also a reader; ancient literary criticism often favours the vocabulary of listening and speaking over that of reading and writing, because the literature was thought of as primarily oral, and the sense of speeches and poems as auditory experiences was never lost.

πλήσια, Τερεντιανὲ ἥδιστε, κἂν αὐτὸς ἐκ πείρας ὑφηγήσαιο.

2. Ἡμῖν δ' ἐκεῖνο διαπορητέον ἐν ἀρχῇ, εἰ ἔστιν ὕψους τις ἢ πάθους[1] τέχνη, ἐπεί τινες ὅλως οἴονται διηπατῆσθαι τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄγοντας εἰς τεχνικὰ παραγγέλματα. γεννᾶται γάρ, φησί, τὰ μεγαλοφυῆ καὶ οὐ διδακτὰ παραγίνεται, καὶ μία τέχνη πρὸς αὐτὰ τὸ πεφυκέναι· χείρω τε τὰ φυσικὰ ἔργα, ὡς οἴονται, καὶ τῷ παντὶ δειλότερα καθίσταται ταῖς
2 τεχνολογίαις κατασκελετευόμενα. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐλεγχθήσεσθαι τοῦθ' ἑτέρως ἔχον φημί, εἰ επισκέψαιτό τις ὅτι ἡ φύσις, ὥσπερ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς καὶ διηρμένοις αὐτόνομον, οὕτως οὐκ εἰκαῖόν τι κἀκ παντὸς ἀμέθοδον εἶναι φιλεῖ· καὶ ὅτι αὕτη μὲν πρῶτόν τι καὶ ἀρχέτυπον γενέσεως στοιχεῖον ἐπὶ πάντων ὑφέστηκεν, τὰς δὲ ποσότητας καὶ τὸν ἐφ' ἑκάστου καιρὸν ἔτι δὲ τὴν ἁπλανεστάτην ἄσκησίν τε καὶ χρῆσιν ἱκανὴ πορίσαι[2] καὶ συνενεγκεῖν ἡ μέθοδος· καὶ ὡς ἐπικινδυνότερα αὐτὰ ἐφ' αὑτῶν δίχα ἐπιστήμης ἀστήρικτα καὶ ἀνερμάτιστα ἐαθέντα τὰ μεγάλα, ἐπὶ μόνῃ τῇ φορᾷ καὶ ἀμαθεῖ τόλμῃ λειπόμενα· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὡς κέντρου πολλάκις, οὕτω δὲ
3 καὶ χαλινοῦ· ὅπερ γὰρ ὁ Δημοσθένης ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποφαίνεται βίου, μέγιστον μὲν εἶναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὸ εὐτυχεῖν, δεύτερον δὲ καὶ οὐκ

[1] πάθους is an old conjecture, presupposed by the translation of G. da Falgano (1575) and found in many later editions: P has βάθους.

[2] πορίσαι P marg., for παρορίσαι.

power of the speaker at a single stroke. But, as I say, my dear Terentianus, these and other such hints you with your experience could supply yourself.

2. We must begin now by raising the question whether there is an art of sublimity or emotion,[a] for some think those are wholly at fault who try to bring such matters under systematic rules. Genius, it is said, is born and does not come of teaching, and the only art for producing it is nature. Works of natural genius, so people think, are spoiled and utterly demeaned by being reduced to the dry bones of rule and precept. For my part I hold that the opposite may be proved, if we consider that while in matters of elevation and emotion Nature for the most part knows no law, yet it is not the way of Nature to work at random and wholly without system. In all production Nature is the first and primary element; but all matters of degree, of the happy moment in each case, and again of the safest rules of practice and use, are adequately provided and contributed by system. We must remember also that mere grandeur runs the greatest risk if left to itself without the stay and ballast of scientific method and abandoned to the impetus of uninstructed temerity. For genius needs the curb as often as the spur. Speaking of the common life of men Demosthenes[b] declares that the greatest of all blessings is good fortune, and that next

[a] This translates the emendation *pathous* for the manuscript reading *bathous*, which has been interpreted as "profundity" or "bathos."

[b] *Oration* 23.113.

ἔλαττον τὸ εὖ βουλεύεσθαι, ὅπερ οἷς ἂν μὴ παρῇ συναναιρεῖ πάντως καὶ θάτερον, τοῦτ' ἂν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων εἴποιμεν, ὡς ἡ μὲν[1] φύσις τὴν τῆς εὐτυχίας τάξιν ἐπέχει, ἡ τέχνη δὲ τὴν τῆς εὐβουλίας· τὸ δὲ κυριώτατον, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναί τινα τῶν ἐν λόγοις ἐπὶ μόνῃ τῇ φύσει οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἡμᾶς ἢ παρὰ τῆς τέχνης ἐκμαθεῖν δεῖ· εἰ ταῦθ', ὡς ἔφην, ἐπιλογίσαιτο καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ τοῖς χρηστομαθοῦσιν ἐπιτιμῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἔτι, μοὶ δοκῶ, περιττὴν καὶ ἄχρηστον τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἡγήσαιτο θεωρίαν.

3. . . . καὶ καμίνου σχῶσι μάκιστον σέλας.
εἰ γάρ τιν' ἑστιοῦχον ὄψομαι μόνον,
μίαν παρείρας πλεκτάνην χειμάρροον,
στέγην πυρώσω καὶ κατανθρακώσομαι·
νῦν δ' οὐ κέκραγά πω τὸ γενναῖον μέλος.

οὐ τραγικὰ ἔτι ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ παρατράγῳδα, αἱ πλεκτάναι καὶ τὸ πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἐξεμεῖν καὶ τὸ τὸν Βορέαν αὐλητὴν ποιεῖν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἑξῆς· τεθόλωται γὰρ τῇ φράσει καὶ τεθορύβηται ταῖς φαντασίαις μᾶλλον ἢ δεδείνωται, κἂν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐγὰς ἀνασκοπῇς, ἐκ τοῦ φοβεροῦ κατ' ὀλίγον ὑπονοστεῖ πρὸς τὸ εὐκαταφρόνητον. ὅπου δ' ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ, πράγματι ὀγκηρῷ φύσει καὶ ἐπιδεχομένῳ στόμφον, ὅμως τὸ παρὰ μέλος οἰδεῖν ἀσύγγνωστον,
2 σχολῇ γ' ἂν οἶμαι λόγοις ἀληθινοῖς ἁρμόσειεν.

[1] At this point, two pages of P have been lost; two of the later manuscripts (A and B) preserve the passage *φύσις . . . θεωρίαν.*

comes good judgement, which is indeed quite as important, since the lack of it often completely cancels the advantage of the former. We may apply this to literature and say that Nature fills the place of good fortune, Art that of good judgement. And above all we must remember this: the very fact that in literature some effects come of natural genius alone can only be learned from art. If then, as I said, whose who censure students of this subject would lay these considerations to heart, they would not, I fancy, be any longer inclined to consider the investigation of our present topic superfluous and useless.

[*Two pages of the manuscript are missing here.*]

3. . . . and they check the chimney's towering blaze.
For if I see one hearthholder alone,
I'll weave one torrent coronal of flame
And fire his homestead to a heap of ash.
But not yet have I blown the noble strain.[a]

All this has lost the tone of tragedy: it is pseudo-tragic—the "coronals" and "spewing to heaven" and making Boreas a piper and all the rest of it. The phrasing is turbid, while the images make for confusion rather than forcefulness. Examine each in the light of day and it gradually sinks from the terrible to the ridiculous. Now seeing that in tragedy, which is essentially a majestic matter and admits of bombast, misplaced tumidity is none the less unpardonable, it is even less likely to suit real

[a] Probably from Aeschylus' *Orithyia* (fr. 281 Radt). The speaker is Boreas.

ταύτῃ καὶ τὰ τοῦ Λεοντίνου Γοργίου γελᾶται γράφοντος "Ξέρξης ὁ τῶν Περσῶν Ζεύς," καί "γῦπες ἔμψυχοι τάφοι," καί τινα τῶν Καλλισθένους ὄντα οὐχ ὑψηλὰ ἀλλὰ μετέωρα, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὰ Κλειτάρχου· φλοιώδης γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ φυσῶν κατὰ τὸν Σοφοκλέα "μικροῖς μὲν αὐλίσκοισι, φορβειᾶς δ' ἄτερ"· τά γε μὴν Ἀμφικράτους τοιαῦτα καὶ Ἡγησίου καὶ Μάτριδος· πολλαχοῦ γὰρ ἐνθουσιᾶν ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντες οὐ βακχεύουσιν ἀλλὰ παίζουσιν.

3 ὅλως δ' ἔοικεν εἶναι τὸ οἰδεῖν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα δυσφυλακτότατον. φύσει γὰρ ἅπαντες οἱ μεγέθους ἐφιέμενοι, φεύγοντες ἀσθενείας καὶ ξηρότητος κατάγνωσιν, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῦθ' ὑποφέρονται, πειθόμενοι τῷ "μεγάλων ἁπολισθαίνειν ὅμως εὐγενὲς

4 ἁμάρτημα." κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι καὶ ἐπὶ σωμάτων καὶ λόγων οἱ χαῦνοι καὶ ἀναλήθεις καὶ μήποτε περιστάντες ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὐναντίον· οὐδὲν γάρ, φασί, ξηρότερον ὑδρωπικοῦ.

Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν οἰδοῦν ὑπεραίρειν βούλεται τὰ ὕψη, τὸ δὲ μειρακιῶδες ἄντικρυς ὑπεναντίον τοῖς μεγέθεσι· ταπεινὸν γὰρ ἐξ ὅλου καὶ μικρόψυχον καὶ τῷ ὄντι κακὸν ἀγεννέστατον. τί ποτ' οὖν τὸ μειρακιῶδές ἐστιν; ἢ δῆλον ὡς σχολαστικὴ νόησις, ὑπὸ περιεργίας λήγουσα εἰς ψυχρότητα; ὀλισθαίνουσι δ'

---

[a] Gorgias fr. B 5a Diels-Kranz (*Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*[6]). [b] Nephew of Aristotle and historian of Alexander.

[c] Historian of Alexander, writing in the reign of Ptolemy II (285–246 B.C.).

speeches. Thus it is that people laugh at Gorgias of Leontini for calling Xerxes "the Persian Zeus," and vultures "living sepulchres";[a] also at certain phrases of Callisthenes[b] which are not sublime but highfalutin, and still more at some of Clitarchus's[c] efforts, an affected creature, blowing, as Sophocles says, "on scrannel pipes, yet wasting all his wind."[d] You find the same sort of thing in Amphicrates too, and in Hegesias and Matris.[e] For often when they think themselves inspired, their supposed ecstasy is merely childish folly. Speaking generally, tumidity seems one of the hardest faults to guard against. For all who aim at grandeur, in trying to avoid the charge of being feeble and arid, fall somehow into this fault, pinning their faith to the maxim that "to miss a high aim is to fail without shame." Tumours are bad things whether in books or bodies, those empty inflations, void of sincerity, as likely as not producing the opposite to the effect intended. For, as they say, "there's naught so dry as dropsy."

But, while tumidity seeks to outdo the sublime, puerility is the exact opposite of grandeur; utterly abject, mean spirited, and in fact the most ignoble of faults. What then is puerility? Is it not obviously an idea born in the classroom, whose overelaboration ends in frigid failure? Writ-

[d] Cicero (*Ad Atticum* 2.16.2) quotes a different version of this passage (= fr. 768 Radt), and Longinus perhaps adapts it to his own purpose.

[e] These Hellenistic writers were all despised by classicizing critics of the Augustan and later periods. Amphicrates fled from Athens to Seleucia in 86 B.C. Hegesias of Magnesia dates from the third century B.C. Matris of Thebes wrote hymns and encomia. For Hegesias' style, see E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* 134ff.

εἰς τοῦτο τὸ γένος ὀρεγόμενοι μὲν τοῦ περιττοῦ καὶ πεποιημένου καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ ἡδέος, ἐξοκέλλοντες[1] δὲ εἰς τὸ ῥωπικὸν καὶ κακόζηλον. τούτῳ παράκειται τρίτον τι κακίας εἶδος ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς, ὅπερ ὁ Θεόδωρος παρένθυρσον ἐκάλει. ἔστι δὲ πάθος ἄκαιρον καὶ κενὸν ἔνθα μὴ δεῖ πάθους, ἢ ἄμετρον ἔνθα μετρίου δεῖ. πολλὰ γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐκ μέθης τινὲς εἰς τὰ μηκέτι τοῦ πράγματος, ἴδια <δ'>[2] ἑαυτῶν καὶ σχολικὰ παραφέρονται πάθη, εἶτα πρὸς οὐδὲν πεπονθότας ἀκροατὰς ἀσχημονοῦσιν εἰκότως, ἐξεστηκότες πρὸς οὐκ ἐξεστηκότας. πλὴν περὶ μὲν τῶν παθητικῶν ἄλλος ἡμῖν ἀπόκειται τόπος.

4. Θατέρου δὲ ὧν εἴπομεν, λέγω δὲ τοῦ ψυχροῦ, πλήρης ὁ Τίμαιος, ἀνὴρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἱκανὸς καὶ πρὸς λόγων ἐνίοτε μέγεθος οὐκ ἄφορος, πολυΐστωρ, ἐπινοητικός, πλὴν ἀλλοτρίων μὲν ἐλεγκτικώτατος ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀνεπαίσθητος δὲ ἰδίων, ὑπὸ δὲ ἔρωτος τοῦ ξένας νοήσεις ἀεὶ κινεῖν πολλάκις ἐκπίπτων εἰς τὸ παιδαριωδέστατον. παραθήσομαι δὲ τἀνδρὸς ἓν ἢ δύο, ἐπειδὴ τὰ πλείω προέλαβεν ὁ Καικίλιος. ἐπαινῶν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν μέγαν "ὃς τὴν Ἀσίαν

[1] ἐξοκέλλοντες Wilamowitz, for ἐποκέλλοντες.
[2] <δ'> add. Faber.

---

[a] Probably a rhetorician from Gadara, one of whose pupils was the emperor Tiberius, and who taught that, so long as the argumentation of a case was sound, the orator need not hold

ers fall into this fault through trying to be uncommon and exquisite, and above all to please, and founder instead upon the rock of cheap affectation. Closely allied to this is a third kind of fault peculiar to emotional passages, what Theodorus[a] used to call the pseudo-bacchanalian. This is emotion misplaced and pointless where none is needed, or unrestrained where restraint is required. For writers often behave as if they were drunk and give way to outbursts of emotion which the subject no longer warrants, but which are private to themselves and consequently tedious, so that to an audience which feels none of it their behaviour looks unseemly. And naturally so, for while they are in ecstasy, the audience is not. However we have reserved another place in which to treat of emotional subjects.[b]

4. The second fault of which we spoke above is Frigidity, of which there are many examples in Timaeus, in other respects a capable writer and sometimes not at all badly endowed for greatness of style, learned, and full of ideas. Yet while keenly critical of others' faults, he is blind and deaf to his own, and his insatiable passion for starting strange conceits often lands him in the most puerile effects. I will quote only one or two examples from Timaeus,[c] as Caecilius has forestalled me with most of them. In his eulogy of Alexander the Great he speaks

religiously to the traditional arrangement of prooemium, narrative, argument, counterargument, and peroration.

[b] If this refers to the present treatise, and not to a separate work (see Introd.), it must be to a passage now lost.

[c] A Sicilian historian (from Tauromenium), who died c. 260 B.C.; he is adversely criticized by Polybius for inaccuracy and bad taste.

ὅλην" φησίν "ἐν ἐλάττοσι<ν ἔτεσι>[1] παρέλαβεν ἢ ὅσοις τὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πρὸς Πέρσας πολέμου πανηγυρικὸν λόγον Ἰσοκράτους ἔγραψεν." θαυμαστή γε τοῦ Μακεδόνος ἡ πρὸς τὸν σοφιστὴν σύγκρισις· δῆλον γάρ, ὦ Τίμαιε, ὡς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι διὰ τοῦτο πολὺ τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους κατ' ἀνδρείαν ἐλείποντο, ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν τριάκοντα[2] ἔτεσι Μεσσήνην παρέλαβον, ὁ δὲ τὸν πανηγυρικὸν ἐν μόνοις δέκα συνετά-
3 ξατο. τοῖς δὲ Ἀθηναίοις ἁλοῦσιν περὶ Σικελίαν τίνα τρόπον ἐπιφωνεῖ; ὅτι "εἰς τὸν Ἑρμῆν ἀσεβήσαντες καὶ περικόψαντες αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀγάλματα, διὰ τοῦτ' ἔδωκαν δίκην οὐχ ἥκιστα δι' ἕνα ἄνδρα, ὃς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρανομηθέντος διὰ πατέρων ἦν, Ἑρμοκράτη τὸν Ἕρμωνος." ὥστε θαυμάζειν με, Τερεντιανὲ ἥδιστε, πῶς οὐ καὶ εἰς Διονύσιον γράφει τὸν τυράννον· "ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰς τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα δυσσεβὴς ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτ' αὐτὸν Δίων καὶ Ἡρακλείδης τῆς
4 τυραννίδος ἀφείλοντο." <καὶ>[3] τί δεῖ περὶ Τιμαίου λέγειν, ὅπου γε καὶ οἱ ἥρωες ἐκεῖνοι, Ξενοφῶντα λέγω καὶ Πλάτωνα, καίτοιγε ἐκ τῆς Σωκράτους ὄντες παλαίστρας, ὅμως διὰ τὰ οὕτως μικροχαρῆ ποτε ἑαυτῶν ἐπιλανθάνονται; ὁ μέν γε ἐν τῇ Λακεδαιμονίων γράφει πολιτείᾳ· "ἐκείνων γοῦν[4] ἧττον μὲν ἂν

[1] add. Spengel.
[2] εἴκοσι Faber.
[3] <καὶ> added by early editors.
[4] P has μὲν before γοῦν, but this is incorrect Greek, and is not in our text of Xenophon (*Resp. Laced.* 3.5).

of "one who subdued the whole of Asia in fewer years than Isocrates took to write his *Panegyric* urging war on Persia."[a] Surely this is an odd comparison of the Macedonian to the sophist, for it is obvious, friend Timaeus, that on this showing Isocrates was a far better man than the Spartans, since they spent thirty years in subduing Messene,[b] while he composed his *Panegyric* in no more than ten! Again, take his final comment on the Athenian prisoners in Sicily: "Having committed sacrilege against Hermes and mutilated his statues they were therefore punished, mainly owing to the action of a single man, who was kin on his father's side to the injured deity, Hermocrates the son of Hermon."[c] This makes me wonder, my dear Terentianus, why he does not write of the tyrant Dionysius that "Having shown impiety towards Zeus and Heracles, he was therefore deprived of his tyranny by Dion and Heracleides."[d] But why speak of Timaeus when those very demi-gods, Xenophon and Plato, for all their training in the school of Socrates, yet sometimes forgot themselves in their fondness for such cheap effects? In his *Constitution of Sparta* Xenophon says, "Certainly you would hear as little speech from these

[a] Isocrates is said to have spent the decade c. 390–380 B.C. working over this famous speech.

[b] The Spartan war of conquest in the eighth century B.C. is usually said to have taken 20 years, but there were later conflicts also. It is unsafe to emend Longinus' figure.

[c] See Plutarch, *Nicias* 1.

[d] The conceit depends on the fact that the oblique cases of *Zeus* are *Dia, Dios, Dii,* so that a pun similar to that on Hermes/Hermocrates is produced.

φωνὴν ἀκούσαις ἢ τῶν λιθίνων, ἧττον δ' ἂν ὄμματα στρέψαις ἢ τῶν χαλκῶν, αἰδημονεστέρους δ' ἂν αὐτοὺς ἡγήσαιο καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων." Ἀμφικράτει καὶ οὐ Ξενοφῶντι ἔπρεπε τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν κόρας λέγειν παρθένους αἰδήμονας· οἷον δὲ Ἡράκλεις τὸ τὰς ἁπάντων ἑξῆς κόρας αἰσχυντηλὰς εἶναι πεπεῖσθαι, ὅπου φασὶν οὐδενὶ οὕτως ἐνσημαίνεσθαι τήν τινων ἀναίδειαν ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς· ἰταμὸν "οἰνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων" φησίν.[1] ὁ μέντοι Τίμαιος, ὡς φωρίου τινὸς ἐφαπτόμενος, οὐδὲ τοῦτο Ξενοφῶντι τὸ ψυχρὸν κατέλιπεν. φησὶ γοῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀγαθοκλέους κατὰ[2] τὸ τὴν ἀνεψιὰν ἑτέρῳ δεδομένην ἐκ τῶν ἀνακαλυπτηρίων ἁρπάσαντα ἀπελθεῖν, "ὃ τίς ἂν ἐποίησεν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κόρας, μὴ πόρνας ἔχων;" τί δὲ ὁ τἆλλα θεῖος Πλάτων; τὰς δέλτους θέλων εἰπεῖν "γράψαντες" φησίν "ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς θήσουσιν κυπαριττίνας μνήμας"· καὶ πάλιν "περὶ δὲ τειχῶν, ὦ Μέγιλλε, ἐγὼ ξυμφεροίμην ἂν τῇ Σπάρτῃ τὸ καθεύδειν ἐᾶν ἐν τῇ γῇ κατακείμενα τὰ τείχη καὶ μὴ ἐπανίστασθαι." καὶ τὸ Ἡροδότειον οὐ πόρρω, τὸ

[1] Kayser deleted *ἰταμὸν . . . φησίν*. The introduction of the Homeric parallel is very abrupt.

[2] *κατὰ* Reiske, for *καὶ*.

Spartans as from marble statues, and could as easily catch the eye of a bronze figure; indeed you might well think them as modest as the maidens in their eyes."[a] It would have better suited Amphicrates than Xenophon to speak of the pupils in our eyes as modest maidens. And fancy believing that every single man of them had modest pupils, when they say that people show their immodesty in nothing so much as their eyes! Why, a violent man is called "Heavy with wine, with the eyes of a dog."[b] However, Timaeus, laying hands as it were on stolen goods, could not leave even this frigid conceit to Xenophon. For example, speaking of Agathocles when he carried off his cousin from the unveiling ceremony[c] although she had been given in marriage to another, he says, "Who could have done such a thing, had he not harlots instead of maidens in his eyes?" And what of the otherwise divine Plato? "They will inscribe and store in the temples," he says, "cypress memorials," meaning wooden tablets: and again, "As for walls, Megillus, I would consent with Sparta to let the walls lie slumbering on the ground and never rise again."[d] Herodotus' phrase for fair women

[a] The manuscript tradition of Xenophon, *Resp. Lac.* 3.5 has "maidens in their chambers" (*τῶν ἐν τοῖς θαλάμοις παρθένων*), but Stobaeus (*Flor.* CXLIV.2.23 Hense) has the same reading as Longinus, which involves a pun on the two meanings of *κόρη*, "girl," and "pupil of the eye" (*pupula*)—a sense presumably derived from the fact that, if you look into someone's pupil closely, you see a doll-like image of yourself. [b] Achilles to Agamemnon, *Iliad* 1.225. [c] I.e. on the third day after the marriage, when the bride first appeared unveiled. Agathocles ruled Syracuse, 317–287 B.C.; this story is not mentioned elsewhere. [d] *Laws* 5.741C, 6.778D, freely quoted.

φάναι τὰς καλὰς γυναῖκας "ἀλγηδόνας ὀφθαλμῶν." καίτοιγε ἔχει τινὰ παραμυθίαν, οἱ γὰρ παρ' αὐτῷ ταυτὶ λέγοντές εἰσιν οἱ βάρβαροι καὶ ἐν μέθῃ, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐκ τοιούτων προσώπων διὰ μικροψυχίαν καλὸν ἀσχημονεῖν πρὸς τὸν αἰῶνα.

5. Ἅπαντα μέντοι τὰ οὕτως ἄσεμνα διὰ μίαν ἐμφύεται τοῖς λόγοις αἰτίαν, διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις καινόσπουδον, περὶ ὃ δὴ μάλιστα κορυβαντιῶσιν οἱ νῦν. ἀφ' ὧν γὰρ ἡμῖν τἀγαθά, σχεδὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν τούτων καὶ τὰ κακὰ γεννᾶσθαι φιλεῖ. ὅθεν ἐπίφορον εἰς συνταγμάτων κατόρθωσιν τά τε κάλλη τῆς ἑρμηνείας καὶ τὰ ὕψη καὶ πρὸς τούτοις αἱ ἡδοναί, καὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα, καθάπερ τῆς ἐπιτυχίας, οὕτως ἀρχαὶ καὶ ὑποθέσεις καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων καθίστανται. τοιοῦτόν πως καὶ αἱ μεταβολαὶ[1] καὶ ὑπερβολαὶ καὶ τὰ πληθυντικά· δείξομεν δ' ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα τὸν κίνδυνον, ὃν ἔχειν ἐοίκασιν. διόπερ ἀναγκαῖον ἤδη διαπορεῖν καὶ ὑποτίθεσθαι, δι' ὅτου τρόπου τὰς ἀνακεκραμένας κακίας τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς ἐκφεύγειν δυνάμεθα.

6. Ἔστι δέ, ὦ φίλος, εἴ τινα περιποιησαίμεθ' ἐν πρώτοις καθαρὰν τοῦ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὕψους ἐπιστήμην καὶ ἐπίκρισιν. καίτοι τὸ πρᾶγμα δύσληπτον· ἡ γὰρ τῶν λόγων κρίσις πολλῆς ἐστι πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγέννημα· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ', ὡς εἰπεῖν ἐν παραγγέλματι, ἐντεῦθέν ποθεν ἴσως τὴν διάγνωσιν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀδύνατον πορίζεσθαι.

[1] μεταφοραὶ Wilamowitz

is not much better: "torments for eyes" he calls them.[a] Yet he has some excuse, for in Herodotus this is said by the barbarians, who are, moreover, in their cups. Yet even in the mouths of such characters as these it is not right to display the triviality of one's mind before an audience of all the ages.

5. However, all these lapses from dignity in literature spring from the same cause, namely that passion for novelty of thought which is the particular craze of the present day. For our virtues and vices spring from much the same sources. And so while beauty of style, sublimity, yes, and charm too, all contribute to successful composition, yet these same things are the source and groundwork no less of failure than of success. And we must say the same, I suppose, about variety of construction, hyperbole, and the use of plurals for singulars. We will show later[b] the danger which they seem to us to involve. We are thus bound at this stage to raise and propose the answer to the question how we can avoid the faults that go so closely with the elevated style.

6. And this, my friend, is the way: first of all to obtain a clear knowledge and appreciation of what is really sublime. But this is not an easy thing to grasp: judgement in literature is the ultimate fruit of ripe experience. However, if I must speak of precept, it is perhaps not impossible that a true discernment in such matters may be derived from some such considerations as the following.

[a] Herodotus 5.18, in an amusing account of the way the Macedonians entertained the Persian invaders of Greece.

[b] In chapters 23 and 38.

7. Εἰδέναι χρή, φίλτατε, διότι, καθάπερ κἀν τῷ κοινῷ βίῳ οὐδὲν ὑπάρχει μέγα, οὗ τὸ καταφρονεῖν ἐστιν μέγα, οἷον πλοῦτοι τιμαὶ δόξαι τυραννίδες καὶ ὅσα δὴ ἄλλα ἔχει πολὺ τὸ ἔξωθεν προστραγῳδούμενον οὐδ'[1] ἂν τῷ γε φρονίμῳ δόξειεν ἀγαθὰ ὑπερβάλλοντα, ὧν αὐτὸ τὸ περιφρονεῖν ἀγαθὸν οὐ μέτριον—θαυμάζουσι γοῦν τῶν ἐχόντων αὐτὰ μᾶλλον τοὺς δυναμένους ἔχειν καὶ διὰ μεγαλοψυχίαν ὑπερορῶντας—τῇδέ που καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διηρμένων ἐν ποιήμασι καὶ λόγοις ἐπισκεπτέον, μή τινα μεγέθους φαντασίαν ἔχοι τοιαύτην ᾗ πολὺ πρόσκειται τὸ εἰκῇ προσαναπλαττόμενον, ἀναπτυττόμενα δὲ ἄλλως εὑρίσκοιτο χαῦνα, ὧν τοῦ θαυμάζειν τὸ περιφρονεῖν
2 εὐγενέστερον. φύσει γάρ πως ὑπὸ τἀληθοῦς ὕψους ἐπαίρεταί τε ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ γαῦρόν τι παράστημα[2] λαμβάνουσα πληροῦται χαρᾶς καὶ μεγα-
3 λαυχίας, ὡς αὐτὴ γεννήσασα ὅπερ ἤκουσεν. ὅταν οὖν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς ἔμφρονος καὶ ἐμπείρου λόγων πολλάκις ἀκουόμενόν τι πρὸς μεγαλοφροσύνην τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ συνδιατιθῇ μηδ' ἐγκαταλείπῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ πλεῖον τοῦ λεγομένου τὸ ἀναθεωρούμενον, πίπτῃ δ', ἂν αὐτὸ[3] συνεχὲς ἐπισκοπῇς, εἰς ἀπαύξησιν, οὐκ ἂν ἔτ' ἀληθὲς ὕψος εἴη μέχρι μόνης τῆς ἀκοῆς σῳζόμενον. τοῦτο γὰρ τῷ ὄντι μέγα, οὗ πολλὴ μὲν ἡ ἀναθεώρησις, δύσκολος δέ, μᾶλλον δ' ἀδύνατος ἡ κατεξανάστασις, ἰσχυρὰ δὲ ἡ μνήμη καὶ δυσεξάλει-

[1] οὐδ' Reiske, for οὐκ.

7. We must realize, dear friend, that as in our everyday life nothing is really great which it is a mark of greatness to despise, I mean, for instance, wealth, position, reputation, sovereignty, and all the other things which possess a very grand exterior, nor would a wise man think things supremely good, contempt for which is itself eminently good—certainly men feel less admiration for those who have these things than for those who could have them but are big enough to slight them—well, so it is with the lofty style in poetry and prose. We must consider whether some of these passages have merely some such outward show of grandeur with a rich layer of casual accretions, and whether, if all this is peeled off, they may not turn out to be empty bombast which it is more noble to despise than to admire. For the true sublime naturally elevates us: uplifted with a sense of proud exaltation, we are filled iwth joy and pride, as if we had ourselves produced the very thing we heard. If, then, a man of sense, well-versed in literature, after hearing a passage several times finds that it does not affect him with a sense of sublimity, and does not leave behind in his mind more food for thought than the words at first suggest, but rather that on consideration it sinks into the bathetic, then it cannot really be the true sublime, if its effect does not outlast the moment of utterance. For what is truly great bears repeated consideration; it is difficult, nay, impossible, to resist its effect; and the memory of it is stubborn and

---

[2] *παράστημα* Manutius, for *ἀνάστημα*.

[3] *ἂν αὐτὸ* Pearce, for *ἄνευ τὸ*.

4 πτος. ὅλως δὲ καλὰ νόμιζε ὕψη καὶ ἀληθινὰ τὰ διὰ παντὸς ἀρέσκοντα καὶ πᾶσιν. ὅταν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπὸ διαφόρων ἐπιτηδευμάτων βίων ζήλων ἡλικιῶν λόγων[1] ἕν τι καὶ ταὐτὸν ἅμα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἅπασιν δοκῇ, τόθ' ἡ ἐξ ἀσυμφώνων ὡς κρίσις καὶ συγκατάθεσις τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ θαυμαζομένῳ πίστιν ἰσχυρὰν λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναμφίλεκτον.

8. Ἐπεὶ δὲ πέντε, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, πηγαί τινές εἰσιν αἱ τῆς ὑψηγορίας γονιμώταται, προϋποκειμένης ὥσπερ ἐδάφους τινὸς κοινοῦ ταῖς πέντε ταύταις ἰδέαις τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν δυνάμεως, ἧς ὅλως χωρὶς οὐδέν, πρῶτον μὲν καὶ κράτιστον τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις ἀδρεπήβολον, ὡς κἀν τοῖς περὶ Ξενοφῶντος ὡρισάμεθα· δεύτερον δὲ τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος· ἀλλ' αἱ μὲν δύο αὗται τοῦ ὕψους κατὰ τὸ πλέον αὐθιγενεῖς συστάσεις, αἱ λοιπαὶ δ' ἤδη καὶ διὰ τέχνης, ἥ τε ποιὰ τῶν σχημάτων πλάσις—δισσὰ δέ που ταῦτα, τὰ μὲν νοήσεως, θάτερα δὲ λέξεως—ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις ἡ γενναία φράσις, ἧς μέρη πάλιν ὀνομάτων τε ἐκλογὴ καὶ ἡ τροπικὴ καὶ πεποιημένη λέξις· πέμπτη δὲ μεγέθους αἰτία καὶ συγκλείουσα τὰ πρὸ ἑαυτῆς ἅπαντα, ἡ ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρσει σύνθεσις· φέρε δὴ τὰ ἐμπεριεχόμενα καθ' ἑκάστην ἰδέαν τούτων ἐπισκεψώμεθα, τοσοῦτον προειπόντες, ὅτι τῶν πέντε μορίων ὁ Καικίλιος ἔστιν

[1] *χρόνων* Richards, *τρόπων* Morus.

indelible. To speak generally, you should consider that to be beautifully and truly sublime which pleases all people at all times. For when men who differ in their pursuits, their lives, their tastes, their ages, their languages,[a] all agree together in holding one and the same view about the same writings, then the unanimous verdict, as it were, of such discordant judges makes our faith in the admired passage strong and indisputable.

8. There are, one may say, some five most productive sources of the sublime in literature, the common groundwork, as it were, of all five being competence in speaking, without which nothing can be done. The first and most powerful is the power of grand conceptions—I have defined this in my book on Xenophon[b]—and the second is the inspiration of vehement emotion. These two constituents of the sublime are for the most part congenital. But the other three come partly from art, namely the proper construction of figures—these being of course of two kinds, figures of thought and figures of speech—and, over and above these, nobility of language, which again may be resolved into choice of words and the use of metaphor and elaborated diction. The fifth cause of grandeur, which gives form to all those already mentioned, is dignified and elevated word-arrangement. Let us then consider all that is involved under each of these heads, merely prefacing this, that Caecilius has omitted

[a] Text unsure: the suggested emendations mean "dates" or "manners."

[b] This book is lost.

2 ἃ παρέλιπεν, ὡς καὶ τὸ πάθος ἀμέλει. ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ὡς ἕν τι ταῦτ' ἄμφω, τό τε ὕψος καὶ τὸ παθητικόν, καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ πάντη συννυπάρχειν τε ἀλλήλοις καὶ συμπεφυκέναι, διαμαρτάνει· καὶ γὰρ πάθη τινὰ διεστῶτα ὕψους καὶ ταπεινὰ εὑρίσκεται, καθάπερ οἶκτοι λῦπαι φόβοι, καὶ ἔμπαλιν πολλὰ ὕψη δίχα πάθους, ὡς πρὸς μυρίοις ἄλλοις καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς Ἀλωάδας τῷ ποιητῇ παρατετολμημένα·

Ὄσσαν ἐπ' Οὐλύμπῳ μέμασαν θέμεν· αὐτὰρ ἐπ' Ὄσσῃ
Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἵν' οὐρανὸς ἄμβατος εἴη·

καὶ τὸ τούτοις ἔτι μεῖζον ἐπιφερόμενον

καί νύ κεν ἐξετέλεσσαν.

3 παρά γε μὴν τοῖς ῥήτορσι τὰ ἐγκώμια καὶ τὰ πομπικὰ καὶ ἐπιδεικτικὰ τὸν μὲν ὄγκον καὶ τὸ ὑψηλὸν ἐξ ἅπαντος περιέχει, πάθους δὲ χηρεύει κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον· ὅθεν ἥκιστα τῶν ῥητόρων οἱ περιπαθεῖς ἐγκω-
4 μιαστικοὶ ἢ ἔμπαλιν οἱ ἐπαινετικοὶ περιπαθεῖς. εἰ δ' αὖ πάλιν ἐξ ὅλου μὴ ἐνόμισεν <ὁ>[1] Καικίλιος τὸ ἐμπαθὲς <εἰς>[2] τὰ ὕψη ποτὲ συντελεῖν καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' οὐχ ἡγήσατο μνήμης ἄξιον, πάνυ διημάρτηται· θαρρῶν γὰρ ἀφορισαίμην ἄν, ὡς μεγαλήγορον, ὥσπερ ὑπὸ μανίας τινὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐνθουσιαστικῶς ἐπιπνέον[3] καὶ οἱονεὶ φοιβάζον τοὺς λόγους.

9. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τὴν κρατίστην μοῖραν ἐπ-

[1] <ὁ> add. Manutius. [2] add. Faber.

some of these five classes, one obvious omission being that of emotion. Now if he thought that sublimity and emotion were the same thing, and that one always essentially involved the other, he is wrong. For one can find emotions that are mean and devoid of sublimity, for instance feelings of pity, grief, and fear. On the other hand, many sublime passages are quite without emotion. Examples are countless: take for instance the poet's daring lies about the Aloadae:[a]

> Ossa then up on Olympus they strove to set, then upon Ossa
> Pelion, ashiver with leaves, to build them a ladder to Heaven;

and the still greater exaggeration that follows,

> And they would have done it as well.

Then again in the orators their eulogies and ceremonial speeches and show pieces always include touches of dignity and sublimity, yet are usually void of emotion. The result is that emotional orators excel least in eulogy, while panegyrists equally lack emotional power. If, on the other hand, it never entered Caecilius' head that emotion sometimes contributes towards sublimity, and he therefore omitted it as undeserving of mention, then great indeed is his mistake. I would confidently lay it down that nothing makes so much for grandeur as genuine emotion in the right place. It inspires the words as it were with a fine frenzy and fills them with divine spirit.

9. Now, since the first, I mean natural, greatness plays

[a] *Odyssey* 11.315.

---

[3] Morus, for ἐκπνέον.

ἔχει τῶν ἄλλων τὸ πρῶτον, λέγω δὲ τὸ μεγαλοφυές, χρὴ κἀνταῦθα, καὶ εἰ δωρητὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα μᾶλλον ἢ κτητόν, ὅμως καθ' ὅσον οἷόν τε τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνατρέ-
2 φειν πρὸς τὰ μεγέθη καὶ ὥσπερ ἐγκύμονας ἀεὶ ποιεῖν γενναίου παραστήματος. τίνα, φήσεις, τρόπον; γέγραφά που καὶ ἑτέρωθι τὸ τοιοῦτον· ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα. ὅθεν καὶ φωνῆς δίχα θαυμάζεταί ποτε ψιλὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἔννοια δι' αὐτὸ τὸ μεγαλόφρον, ὡς ἡ τοῦ Αἴαντος ἐν Νεκυίᾳ σιωπὴ μέγα
3 καὶ παντὸς ὑψηλότερον λόγου. πρῶτον οὖν τὸ ἐξ οὗ γίνεται προϋποτίθεσθαι πάντως ἀναγκαῖον, ὡς ἔχειν δεῖ τὸν ἀληθῆ ῥήτορα μὴ ταπεινὸν φρόνημα καὶ ἀγεννές. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἷόν τε μικρὰ καὶ δουλοπρεπῆ φρονοῦντας καὶ ἐπιτηδεύοντας παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον θαυμαστόν τι καὶ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἐξενεγκεῖν ἄξιον· μεγάλοι δὲ οἱ λόγοι τούτων κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ὧν
4 ἂν ἐμβριθεῖς ὦσιν αἱ ἔννοιαι. ταύτῃ καὶ εἰς τοὺς μάλιστα φρονηματίας ἐμπίπτει τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ· ὁ γὰρ τῷ Παρμενίωνι φήσαντι "ἐγὼ μὲν ἠρκέσθην . . .[1]

. . . τὸ ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἀπὸ γῆς διάστημα· καὶ τοῦτ' ἂν εἴποι τις οὐ μᾶλλον τῆς Ἔριδος ἢ Ὁμήρου

[1] P lost a whole quaternion (8 pages) after ἀδρεπηβόλον (above, 8.1); but the two outer pages are preserved in copies made when the damage was less; these however fail us at this point. P resumes at ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον (9.10).

[a] *Odyssey* 11.543–67. Ajax, summoned from Hades, refuses

a greater part than all the others, here too, even if it is rather a gift than an acquired quality, we should still do our utmost to train our minds into sympathy with what is noble and, as it were, impregnate them again and again with lofty thoughts. "How?" you will ask. Well, elsewhere I have written something like this, "Sublimity is the echo of a noble mind." And so even without being spoken the bare idea often of itself wins admiration for its inherent grandeur. How grand, for instance, is the silence of Ajax in the Summoning of the Ghosts,[a] more sublime than any speech! In the first place, then, it is absolutely necessary to state whence greatness comes, and to show that the thought of the genuine orator must be neither small nor ignoble. For it is impossible that those whose thoughts and habits all their lives long are petty and servile should produce anything wonderful, worthy of immortal life. No, a grand style is the natural product of those whose ideas are weighty. This is why splendid remarks come particularly to men of high spirit. Alexander's answer to Parmenio when he said "For my part I had been content . . ."[b]

[*Six pages are lost here.*]

. . . the distance between earth and heaven. One might say too that this measured the stature not of Strife

to speak to Odysseus, because he is still angry at the award of Achilles' armour to Odysseus rather than to himself.

[b] The story (told in most of the historians of Alexander: see e.g. Plutarch, *Alexander* 29), and perhaps derived from Callisthenes, is that Darius offered Alexander territory and one of his daughters in marriage; Parmenio said "If I were Alexander, I should have accepted," and Alexander replied "If I were Parmenio, so should I."

5 μέτρον. ὦ ἀνόμοιόν γε τὸ Ἡσιόδειον ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀχλύος, εἴγε Ἡσιόδου καὶ τὴν Ἀσπίδα θετέον,

τῆς ἐκ μὲν ῥινῶν μύξαι ῥέον·

οὐ γὰρ δεινὸν ἐποίησε τὸ εἴδωλον, ἀλλὰ μισητόν. ὁ δὲ πῶς μεγεθύνει τὰ δαιμόνια;

ὅσσον δ' ἠεροειδὲς ἀνὴρ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,
ἥμενος ἐν σκοπιῇ, λεύσσων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον,
τόσσον ἐπιθρώσκουσι θεῶν ὑψηχέες ἵπποι.

τὴν ὁρμὴν αὐτῶν κοσμικῷ διαστήματι καταμετρεῖ. τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ μεγέθους ἐπιφθέγξαιτο, ὅτι ἂν δὶς ἑξῆς ὀφορμήσωσιν οἱ τῶν θεῶν ἵπποι, οὐκέθ' εὑρήσουσιν ἐν κόσμῳ τόπον;

6 ὑπερφυᾶ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς θεομαχίας φαντάσματα·

ἀμφὶ δὲ σάλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανὸς Οὔλυμπός τε.
ἔδδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀϊδωνεύς,
δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἆλτο καὶ ἴαχε, μή οἱ ἔπειτα

---

[a] Evidently *Iliad* 4.442:

Small is the crest that she rears at the first, but behold her thereafter
Planting her head in the skies, while she treads with her feet on the earth.

so much as of Homer.[a] Quite unlike this is Hesiod's description of Gloom, if indeed we are right in adding the *Shield* to the list of Hesiod's works:[b]

> Mucus from her nostrils was running.

He has made the image not terrible, but repulsive. But see how Homer magnifies the powers of heaven:

> Far as a man can see with his eyes in the shadowy distance,
> Keeping his watch on a hilltop, agaze o'er the wine-dark ocean,
> So far leap at a bound the high-neighing horses of heaven.[c]

He uses a cosmic interval to measure their stride. So supreme is the grandeur of this, one might well say that if the horses of heaven take two consecutive strides there will then be no place found for them in the world. Marvellous too is the imaginative picture of his Battle of the Gods:

> Blared round about like a trumpet the firmament vast and Olympus;
> Shuddering down in the depths, the king of the dead, Aïdoneus,

[b] *Shield of Heracles* 267. Aristophanes of Byzantium was among the ancient scholars who regarded the *Shield* as perhaps not Hesiod's, but Apollonius and others took it to be genuine.

[c] *Iliad* 5.770–2.

γαῖαν ἀναρρήξειε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,
οἰκία δὲ θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι φανείη,
σμερδαλέ' εὐρώεντα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.

ἐπιβλέπεις, ἑταῖρε, ὡς ἀναρρηγνυμένης μὲν ἐκ βάθρων γῆς, αὐτοῦ δὲ γυμνουμένου ταρτάρου, ἀνατροπὴν δὲ ὅλου καὶ διάστασιν τοῦ κόσμου λαμβάνοντος, πάνθ' ἅμα, οὐρανὸς ᾅδης, τὰ θνητὰ τὰ ἀθάνατα, ἅμα τῇ τότε συμπολεμεῖ καὶ συγκινδυνεύει
7 μάχῃ; ἀλλὰ ταῦτα φοβερὰ μέν, πλὴν ἄλλως, εἰ μὴ κατ' ἀλληγορίαν λαμβάνοιτο, παντάπασιν ἄθεα καὶ οὐ σῴζοντα τὸ πρέπον. Ὅμηρος γάρ μοι δοκεῖ παραδιδοὺς τραύματα θεῶν στάσεις τιμωρίας δάκρυα δεσμὰ πάθη πάμφυρτα τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἀνθρώπους ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ δυνάμει θεοὺς πεοιηκέναι, τοὺς θεοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους. ἀλλ' ἡμῖν μὲν δυσδαιμονοῦσιν ἀπόκειται λιμὴν κακῶν ὁ θάνατος, τῶν θεῶν δ' οὐ τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀτυχίαν ἐποίη-
8 σεν αἰώνιον. πολὺ δὲ τῶν περὶ τὴν θεομαχίαν ἀμείνω τὰ ὅσα ἄχραντόν τι καὶ μέγα τὸ δαιμόνιον ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄκρατον παρίστησιν, οἷα (πολλοῖς δὲ πρὸ ἡμῶν ὁ τόπος ἐξείργασται) τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος·

τρέμε δ' οὔρεα μακρὰ καὶ ὕλη
καὶ κορυφαὶ Τρώων τε πόλις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν

---

[a] A conflation of *Iliad* 21.388 and 20.61–5.

[b] A proverbial image, cf. (e.g.) [Plutarch] *Consolation to Apollonius* 10, Epictetus 4.10.27, Seneca, *Agamemnon* 592 (with R. J. Tarrant's note).

Sprang from his throne with a shuddering cry, for
fear the earthshaker, Poseidon,
Might soon splinter asunder the earth, and his
mansions lie open,
Clear to the eyes of immortals and mortals alike all
uncovered,
Grim and dreary and dank, which the very gods see
with abhorrence.[a]

You see, friend, how the earth is split to its foundations, hell itself laid bare, the whole universe sundered and turned upside down; and meanwhile everything, heaven and hell, mortal and immortal alike, shares in the conflict and danger of that battle. Terrible as these passages are, they are utterly irreligious and breach the canons of propriety unless one takes them allegorically. I feel indeed that in recording as he does the wounding of the gods, their quarrels, vengeance, tears, imprisonment, and all their manifold passions Homer has done his best to make the men in the *Iliad* gods and the gods men. Yet, if we mortals are unhappy, death is the "harbour from our troubles,"[b] whereas Homer has given the gods not only immortal natures but immortal sorrows. The Battle of the Gods, however, is far surpassed by those passages which represent the divine nature as truly uncontaminated, majestic, and pure. Take, for instance, the lines about Poseidon, though they have been treated fully enough by others before us:

Trembled the woods, and trembled the long-lying
ranges
Yes, and the peaks and the city of Troy and the
ships of Achaia

ποσσὶν ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι Ποσειδάωνος ἰόντος.
βῆ δ' ἐλάαν ἐπὶ κύματ', ἄταλλε δὲ κήτε' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ
πάντοθεν ἐκ κευθμῶν, οὐδ' ἠγνοίησεν ἄνακτα·
γηθοσύνῃ δὲ θάλασσα διΐστατο, τοὶ δὲ πέτοντο.

9 ταύτῃ καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνήρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θείου δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐχώρησε καὶ ἐξέφηνεν, εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράψας τῶν νόμων "εἶπεν ὁ θεός," φησί· τί; "γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο."

10 Οὐκ ὀχληρὸς ἂν ἴσως, ἑταῖρε, δόξαιμι, ἓν ἔτι τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παραθέμενος τοῦ μαθεῖν χάριν, ὡς εἰς τὰ ἡρωϊκὰ μεγέθη συνεμβαίνειν ἐθίζει. ἀχλὺς ἄφνω καὶ νὺξ ἄπορος αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπέχει μάχην· ἔνθα δὴ ὁ Αἴας ἀμηχανῶν

"Ζεῦ πάτερ," φησίν, "ἀλλὰ σὺ ῥῦσαι ὑπ'
ἠέρος οἷας Ἀχαιῶν,
ποίησον δ' αἴθρην, δὸς δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
ἰδέσθαι·
ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον."

---

[a] Another conflation: *Iliad* 13.18, 20.60, 13.19, 27–9. In view of Longinus' comment, the passage was perhaps put together by earlier critics, and is not simply a confused quotation from memory.

[b] This loose quotation of *Genesis* 1.3–9 has often been suspected of being an interpolation, and indeed the argument runs on without it perfectly well. But there is no reason why Longinus

Under the feet immortal and the oncoming march
of Poseidon.
He set him to drive o'er the swell of the sea, and
the whales at his coming
Capering leapt from the deep and greeted the
voice of their master.
Then the sea parted her waves for joy, and they
flew on the journey.[a]

Soo, too, the lawgiver of the Jews, no ordinary man, having formed a worthy conception of divine power and given expression to it, writes at the very beginning of his *Laws*: "God said"—what? 'let there be light,' and there was light, 'Let there be earth,' and there was earth."[b]

Perhaps you will not think me boring, my friend, if I insert here another passage from the poet, one that treats of human affairs, to show you his habit of entering into the sublimity of his heroic theme. Darkness and helpless night suddenly descend upon his Greek army. At his wits' end Ajax cries:

Zeus Father, rescue from out of the mist the sons of
Achaia,
Brighten the heaven with sunshine, grant us the
sight of our eyes.
Just so it be in daylight, destroy us.[c]

should not have known it; and the tradition that Caecilius may have been a Jew suggests a possible source. The syntax of the sentence is controversial; see now Mazzucchi, pp. 172–4. For the considerable influence of the passage in the eighteenth century, see esp. Boileau, *Réflexions sur le Sublime X*, and Robert Louth's Oxford lectures *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum* (1753).

[c] *Iliad* 17.645–7.

ἔστιν ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ πάθος Αἴαντος, οὐ γὰρ ζῆν εὔχεται (ἦν γὰρ τὸ αἴτημα τοῦ ἥρωος ταπεινότερον), ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐν ἀπράκτῳ σκότει τὴν ἀνδρείαν εἰς οὐδὲν γενναῖον εἶχε διαθέσθαι, διὰ ταῦτ' ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι πρὸς τὴν μάχην ἀργεῖ, φῶς ὅτι τάχιστα αἰτεῖται, ὡς πάντως τῆς ἀρετῆς εὑρήσων ἐντάφιον ἄξιον, κἂν
11 αὐτῷ Ζεὺς ἀντιτάττηται. ἀλλὰ γὰρ Ὅμηρος μὲν ἐνθάδε οὔριος συνεμπνεῖ τοῖς ἀγῶσιν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι αὐτὸς πέπονθεν ἢ

> μαίνεται, ὡς ὅτ' Ἄρης ἐγχέσπαλος ἢ ὀλοὸν
> πῦρ
> οὔρεσι μαίνηται, βαθέης ἐν τάρφεσιν ὕλης,
> ἀφλοισμὸς δὲ περὶ στόμα γίγνεται·

δείκνυσι δ' ὅμως διὰ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας (καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα πολλῶν ἕνεκα προσεπιθεωρητέον), ὅτι μεγάλης φύσεως ὑποφερομένης ἤδη ἴδιόν ἐστιν ἐν γήρᾳ τὸ
12 φιλόμυθον. δῆλος γὰρ ἐκ πολλῶν τε ἄλλων συντεθεικὼς ταύτην δευτέραν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, ἀτὰρ δὴ κἀκ τοῦ λείψανα τῶν Ἰλιακῶν παθημάτων διὰ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας ὡς ἐπεισόδιά τινα[1] προσεπεισφέρειν καὶ νὴ Δί' ἐκ τοῦ τὰς ὀλοφύρσεις καὶ τοὺς οἴκτους ὡς πάλαι που προεγνωσμένους[2] τοῖς ἥρωσιν ἐνταῦθα προσαποδιδόναι· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἐπίλογός ἐστιν ἡ Ὀδυσσεια·

[1] The manuscripts here add τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου, but these words spoil the sense, and are perhaps a gloss on τῶν Ἰλιακῶν παθημάτων.

These are the true feelings of an Ajax. He does not plead for his life: such a prayer would demean the hero: but since the disabling darkness robbed his courage of all noble use, therefore, distressed to be idle in battle, he prays for light on the instant, hoping thus at the worst to find a burial worthy of his courage, even though Zeus be ranged against him. Here indeed the battle is blown along by the force of Homer's writing, and he himself

> Stormily raves, as the spear-wielding War-god, or
> Fire, the destroyer,
> Stormily raves on the hills in the deep-lying thick-
> ets of woodland;
> Fringed are his lips with the foam-froth.[a]

Yet throughout the *Odyssey*, which for many reasons we must not exclude from our consideration, Homer shows that, as genius ebbs, it is the love of storytelling that characterizes old age. There are indeed many indications that he composed this tale after the *Iliad*; for example, throughout the *Odyssey* he introduces as episodes remnants of the adventures at Ilium; yes, and does he not in this poem render to his heroes their meed of lamentation as if it were something long known? In fact the *Odyssey* is simply an epilogue to the *Iliad*:

[a] *Iliad* 15.605.

---

[2] προεγνωσμένοις Reiske (i.e. it is the heroes, not the lamentations, which are "long known").

ἔνθα μὲν Αἴας κεῖται ἀρήϊος, ἔνθα δ'
Ἀχιλλεύς,
ἔνθα δὲ Πάτροκλος, θεόφιν μήστωρ
ἀτάλαντος,
ἔνθα δ' ἐμὸς φίλος υἱός.

13 ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας, οἶμαι, τῆς μὲν Ἰλιάδος γραφομένης ἐν ἀκμῇ πνεύματος ὅλον τὸ σωμάτιον δραματικὸν ὑπεστήσατο καὶ ἐναγώνιον, τῆς δὲ Ὀδυσσείας τὸ πλέον διηγηματικόν, ὅπερ ἴδιον γήρως. ὅθεν ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσείᾳ παρεικάσαι τις ἂν καταδυομένῳ τὸν Ὅμηρον ἡλίῳ, οὗ δίχα τῆς σφοδρότητος παραμένει τὸ μέγεθος. οὐ γὰρ ἔτι τοῖς Ἰλιακοῖς ἐκείνοις ποιήμασιν ἴσον ἐνταῦθα σῴζει τὸν τόνον, οὐδ' ἐξωμαλισμένα τὰ ὕψη καὶ ἰζήματα μηδαμοῦ λαμβάνοντα, οὐδὲ τὴν πρόχυσιν ὁμοίαν τῶν ἐπαλλήλων παθῶν, οὐδὲ τὸ ἀγχίστροφον καὶ πολιτικὸν καὶ ταῖς ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας φαντασίαις καταπεπυκνωμένον, ἀλλ' οἷον ὑποχωροῦντος εἰς ἑαυτὸν Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ περὶ τὰ ἴδια μέτρα ἠμερουμένου[1]
τὸ λοιπὸν φαίνονται τοῦ μεγέθους ἀμπώτιδες κἀν
14 τοῖς μυθώδεσι καὶ ἀπίστοις πλάνος. λέγων δὲ ταῦτ' οὐκ ἐπιλέλησμαι τῶν ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσείᾳ χειμώνων καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Κύκλωπα καί τινων ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ γῆρας διηγοῦμαι, γῆρας δ' ὅμως Ὁμήρου· πλὴν ἐν

[1] So John Price (a seventeenth-century scholar, professor at Pisa: quoted by Toup) for P's ἐρημουμένου ("made desolate").

There then Ajax lies, great warrior; there lies
Achilles;
There, too, Patroclus lies, the peer of the gods in
counsel;
There, too, my own dear son.[a]

It was, I imagine, for the same reason that, writing the *Iliad* in the heyday of his genius he made the whole piece lively with dramatic action, whereas in the *Odyssey* narrative predominates, the characteristic of old age. So in the *Odyssey* one may liken Homer to the setting sun; the grandeur remains without the intensity. For no longer does he preserve the sustained energy of the great *Iliad* lays, the consistent sublimity which never sinks into flatness, the flood of moving incidents in quick succession, the versatile rapidity and actuality, dense with images drawn from real life. It is rather as though the Ocean had retreated into itself and lay quiet within its own confines. Henceforth we see the ebbing tide of Homer's greatness, as he wanders in the realm of the fabulous and incredible. In saying this I have not forgotten the storms in the *Odyssey* and such incidents as that of the Cyclops—I am describing old age, but the old age of a Homer—yet the

[a] *Odyssey* 3.109–11. Both opinions about the order of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were held in antiquity: Seneca (*De brevitate vitae* 13) regards it as a typical example of the useless questions raised by literary scholars.

Other possibilities include Toup's ἠπειρουμένου ("becoming dry land") and, e.g., ἠρέμα κεχυμένου ("quietly flowing").

ἅπασι τούτοις ἐξῆς τοῦ πρακτικοῦ κρατεῖ τὸ μυθικόν.

Παρεξέβην δ' εἰς ταῦθ', ὡς ἔφην, ἵνα δείξαιμι ὡς εἰς λῆρον ἐνίοτε ῥᾷστον κατὰ τὴν ἀπακμὴν[1] τὰ μεγαλοφυῆ παρατρέπεται, οἷα τὰ περὶ τὸν ἀσκὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐκ Κίρκης συομορφουμένους, οὓς ὁ Ζωΐλος ἔφη χοιρίδια κλαίοντα, καὶ τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πελειάδων ὡς νεοσσὸν παρατρεφόμενον Δία καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ναναγίου δέχ' ἡμέρας ἄσιτον τά τε περὶ τὴν μνηστηροφονίαν ἀπίθανα. τί γὰρ ἂν ἄλλο φήσαιμεν ταῦτα ἢ τῷ ὄντι τοῦ Διὸς ἐνύπνια;

Δευτέρου δὲ εἵνεκα προσιστορείσθω τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν, ὅπως ᾖ σοι γνώριμον, ὡς ἡ ἀπακμὴ τοῦ πάθους ἐν τοῖς μεγάλοις συγγραφεῦσι καὶ ποιηταῖς εἰς ἦθος ἐκλύεται. τοιαῦτα γάρ που τὰ περὶ τὴν τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἠθικῶς αὐτῷ βιολογούμενα οἰκίαν, οἱονεὶ κωμῳδία τίς ἐστιν ἠθολογουμένη.

10. Φέρε νῦν, εἴ τι καὶ ἕτερον ἔχοιμεν ὑψηλοὺς ποιεῖν τοὺς λόγους δυνάμενον, ἐπισκεψώμεθα. οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ πᾶσι τοῖς πράγμασι φύσει συνεδρεύει τινὰ μόρια ταῖς ὕλαις συνυπάρχοντα, ἐξ ἀνάγκης γένοιτ' ἂν ἡμῖν ὕψους αἴτιον τὸ τῶν ἐμφερομένων[2]

[1] Manutius, for P's ἀκμήν.
[2] So Toll for P's ἐκφερομένων.

---

[a] Aeolus imprisoned the winds in a wineskin: *Odyssey* 10.19–22.

fact is that in every one of these passages the mythical element predominates over the real.

I have been led into this digression to show you, as I said, that great genius with the decline of vigour often lapses very easily into nonsense—there is the story of the wineskin[a] and the men whom Circe turned into swine[b]—Zoilus called them "porkers in tears"—there is the nurturing of Zeus like a nestling by the doves,[c] Odysseus' ten days without food on the wrecked ship,[d] and the incredible story of the suitors' slaying.[e] Can one call these things anything but veritable dreams of Zeus?[f]

There is another justification for our considering the *Odyssey* as well as the *Iliad*. I wanted you to realize how, in great writers and poets, declining emotional power passes into character portrayals. For instance, his character sketches of the daily life in Odysseus' household constitute a sort of comedy of character.

10. Well, then, let us see whether we can find anything else that can make style sublime. Since with all things there are associated certain elements, inherent in their substance, it follows of necessity that we shall find

[b] *Odyssey* 10.237. Zoilus of Amphipolis—nicknamed *Homeromastix*, Scourge of Homer—was a fourth-century sophist and moralist who criticized improbable and inappropriate features in the epic.

[c] Zeus supplied with ambrosia by doves: *Odyssey* 12.62.

[d] *Odyssey* 12.447.

[e] *Odyssey* 22.

[f] An obscure phrase, probably suggesting that, Homer being Zeus of poets (cf. Quintilian 10.1.46), he sometimes dozes and dreams (*bonus dormitat Homerus*, Horace, *Ars Poetica* 359).

ἐκλέγειν ἀεὶ τὰ καιριώτατα καὶ ταῦτα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα ἐπισυνθέσει καθάπερ ἕν τι σῶμα ποιεῖν δύνασθαι· ὃ[1] μὲν γὰρ τῇ ἐκλογῇ τὸν ἀκροατὴν τῶν λημμάτων, ὃ[1] δὲ τῇ πυκνώσει τῶν ἐκλελεγμένων προσάγεται. οἷον ἡ Σαπφὼ τὰ συμβαίνοντα ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς μανίαις παθήματα ἐκ τῶν παρεπομένων καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς ἑκάστοτε λαμβάνει. ποῦ δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀποδείκνυται; ὅτε τὰ ἄκρα αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπερτεταμένα δεινὴ καὶ ἐκλέξαι καὶ εἰς ἄλληλα συνδῆσαι.

2 φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν
ἔμμεν' ὤνηρ, ὄττις ἐνάντιός τοι
ἰζάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἆδυ φωνεί-
σας ὑπακούει
καὶ γελαίσας ἰμερόεν, τό μ' ἦ μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν.
ὡς γὰρ <ἐς> σ' ἴδω βρόχε' ὡς με φώνας
οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει·
ἀλλὰ κὰμ μὲν γλῶσσα ἔαγε· λέπτον δ'
αὐτίκα χρῷ πῦρ ὑποδεδρόμακεν
ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδὲν ὄρημμ', ἐπιρόμ-
βεισι δ' ἄκουαι·
ἀ δέ μ' ἴδρως[2] κακχέεται, τρόμος δὲ
παῖσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας
ἔμμι· τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης
φαίνομ' <ἐμαυτᾷ>·
ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον, ἐπεὶ †καὶ πένητα†[3]

one factor of sublimity in a consistently happy choice of these constituent elements, and in the power of combining them together as it were into an organic whole. The first procedure attracts the reader by the selection of ideas, the second by the density of those selected. Sappho, for instance, never fails to take the emotions incident to the passion of love from its attendant symptoms and from real life. And wherein does she show her excellence? In the skill with which she selects and combines the most striking and intense of those symptoms.

> I think him God's peer that sits near you face to face, and listens to your sweet speech and lovely laughter.
> It's this that makes my heart flutter in my breast. If I see you but for a little, my voice comes no more and my tongue is broken.
> At once a delicate flame runs through my limbs; I see nothing with my eyes, and my ears thunder.
> The sweat pours down: shivers grip me all over. I am grown paler than grass, and seem to myself to be very near to death.
> But all must be endured, since . . .

[a] Sappho fr. 31, in D. A. Campbell (ed.), *Greek Lyric* I (Loeb Classical Library).

---

[1] So Pearce for P's ὁ in both places.

[2] P has ψυχρὸς after ἰδρῶς (so accented).

[3] We have not sought to reproduce P's text here in detail.

3 οὐ θαυμάζεις, ὡς, ὑπ<ὸ τὸ>[1] αὐτὸ τὴν ψυχὴν τὸ σῶμα τὰς ἀκοὰς τὴν γλῶσσαν τὰς ὄψεις τὴν χρόαν, πάνθ' ὡς ἀλλότρια διοιχόμενα ἐπιζητεῖ καὶ καθ' ὑπεναντιώσεις ἅμα ψύχεται κάεται, ἀλογιστεῖ φρονεῖ [ἢ γὰρ φοβεῖται ἢ παρ' ὀλίγον τέθνηκεν][2] ἵνα μὴ ἔν τι περὶ αὐτὴν πάθος φαίνηται, παθῶν δὲ σύνοδος. πάντα μὲν τοιαῦτα γίνεται περὶ τοὺς ἐρῶντας, ἡ λῆψις δ' ὡς ἔφην τῶν ἄκρων καὶ ἡ εἰς ταὐτὸ συναίρεσις ἀπειργάσατο τὴν ἐξοχήν. ὅνπερ οἶμαι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χειμώνων τρόπον ὁ ποιητὴς ἐκλαμβάνει τῶν
4 παρακολουθούντων τὰ χαλεπώτατα. ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὰ Ἀριμάσπεια ποιήσας ἐκεῖνα οἴεται δεινά·

θαῦμ' ἡμῖν καὶ τοῦτο μέγα φρεσὶν ἡμετέρῃσιν.
ἄνδρες ὕδωρ ναίουσιν ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι·
δύστηνοί τινές εἰσιν, ἔχουσι γὰρ ἔργα πονηρά,
ὄμματ' ἐν ἄστροισι, ψυχὴν δ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἔχουσιν.
ἦ που πολλὰ θεοῖσι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἔχοντες
εὔχονται σπλάγχνοισι κακῶς ἀναβαλλομένοισι.

5 παντὶ οἶμαι δῆλον, ὡς πλέον ἄνθος ἔχει τὰ λεγόμενα ἢ δέος. ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος πῶς; ἓν γὰρ ἀπὸ πολλῶν

[1] Toll: P has ὑπ' αὐτὸ.

[2] [ἢ . . . τέθνηκεν] ("she is either afraid or at the point of death") deleted by Weiske. Fyfe conjectured ἦ γὰρ φοιβᾶται ἢ . . . τέθνηκεν ("she who is at the point of death is surely beside herself").

Is it not wonderful how she summons at the same time, soul, body, hearing, tongue, sight, skin, all as though they had wandered off apart from herself? She feels contradictory sensations, freezes, burns, raves, reasons, so that she displays not a single emotion, but a whole congeries of emotions. Lovers show all such symptoms, but what gives supreme merit to her art is, as I said, the skill with which she takes up the most striking and combines them into a single whole. It is, I fancy, much in the same way that the poet in describing storms picks out the most alarming circumstances. The author of the *Arimaspeia*,[a] to be sure, thinks these lines awe-inspiring:

> Here is another thing also that fills us with feelings
> of wonder,
> Men that dwell on the water, away from the earth,
> on the ocean.
> Sorrowful wretches they are, and theirs is a
> grievous employment:
> Fixing their eyes on the stars, their lives they
> entrust to the waters.
> Often, I think, to the gods they lift up their hands
> and they pray;
> Ever their innermost parts are terribly tossed to
> and fro.

Anyone can see, I fancy, that this is more elegant than awe-inspiring. But how does Homer do it? Let us take

[a] Aristeas of Proconnesus (see J. D. P. Bolton, *Aristeas of Proconnesus*, Oxford 1962, 8–15) wrote an epic description of the peoples of the far North: Herodotus (4.27) interprets *Arimaspi* as derived from Scythian words meaning one-eyed. This passage is fr. 1 Kinkel, fr. 7 Bolton, fr. 11 Bernabé.

λεγέσθω·

ἐν δ' ἔπεσ', ὡς ὅτε κῦμα θοῇ ἐν νηῒ πέσῃσι
λάβρον ὑπαὶ νεφέων ἀνεμοτρεφές, ἡ δέ τε
πᾶσα
ἄχνῃ ὑπεκρύφθη, ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτης
ἱστίῳ ἐμβρέμεται, τρομέουσι δέ τε φρένα
ναῦται
δειδιότες· τυτθὸν γὰρ ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο φέρονται.

6 ἐπεχείρησεν καὶ ὁ Ἄρατος τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο μετενεγκεῖν·

ὀλίγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον ἄϊδ' ἐρύκει·

πλὴν μικρὸν αὐτὸ καὶ γλαφυρὸν ἐποίησεν ἀντὶ φοβεροῦ· ἔτι δὲ παρώρισε τὸν κίνδυνον εἰπών "ξύλον ἄϊδ' ἐρύκει[1]·" οὐκοῦν ἀπείργει·[2] ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς οὐκ εἰς ἅπαξ παρορίζει τὸ δεινόν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀεὶ καὶ μονονουχὶ κατὰ πᾶν κῦμα πολλάκις ἀπολλυμένους εἰκονογραφεῖ. καὶ μὴν τὰς προθέσεις ἀσυνθέτους οὔσας συναναγκάσας παρὰ φύσιν καὶ εἰς ἀλλήλας συμβιασάμενος [ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο][3] τῷ μὲν συνεμπίπτοντι πάθει τὸ ἔπος ὁμοίως ἐβασάνισεν, τῇ δὲ τοῦ ἔπους συνθλίψει τὸ πάθος ἄκρως ἀπεπλάσατο

[1] Manutius: P has ἀπείργει.

[2] οὐκοῦν ἀπείργει (omitted by Robortello) may be a gloss on ἐρύκει (so Ruhnken, Mazzucchi).

[3] [ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο] deleted by "G.S.A." (1811).

one example of many:

> He fell on the host as a wave of the sea on a hurrying vessel,
> Rising up under the clouds, a boisterous son of the storm-wind.
> The good ship is lost in the shroud of the foam, and the breath of the tempest
> Terribly roars in the sails; and in their heart tremble the sailors,
> By the breadth of a hand swept out from under the jaws of destruction.[a]

Aratus, too, tried to adapt this same idea:

> Only the tiniest plank now bars them from bitter destruction.[b]

But he has demeaned the idea and made it pretty instead of awe-inspiring. Moreover, he dismisses the danger when he says, "The plank bars them from destruction." Why then, it keeps it off. Homer, on the other hand, instead of dismissing the danger once and for all, depicts the sailors as being all the time, again and again, with every wave on the very brink of death. Moreover, by forcing into an abnormal union prepositions not usually compounded[c] he has tortured his language into conformity with the impending disaster, magnificently figured the disaster by the compression of his language, and

[a] *Iliad* 15.624–8.
[b] Aratus, *Phaenomena* 299.
[c] I.e. ὑπέκ is a compound of ὑπό ('under') and ἐκ ('from').

καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἐνετύπωσεν τῇ λέξει τοῦ κινδύνου τὸ
7 ἰδίωμα "ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο φέρονται." οὐκ ἄλλως ὁ
Ἀρχίλοχος ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυαγίου, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ προσαγγελίᾳ ὁ Δημοσθένης· "ἑσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν" φησίν. ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐξοχὰς ὡς <ἂν>[1] εἴποι τις ἀριστίνδην ἐκκαθήραντες ἐπισυνέθηκαν, οὐδὲν φλοιῶδες ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικὸν ἐγκατατάττοντες διὰ μέσου. λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον, ὡσανεὶ ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦντα <εἰς>[2] μεγέθη συνοικοδομούμενα[3] τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα.

11. Σύνεδρός ἐστι ταῖς προεκκειμέναις ἀρετῇ καὶ ἣν καλοῦσιν αὔξησιν, ὅταν δεχομένων τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἀγώνων κατὰ περιόδους ἀρχάς τε πολλὰς καὶ ἀναπαύλας ἕτερα ἑτέροις ἐπεισκυκλούμενα
2 μεγέθη συνεχῶς ἐπεισάγηται κατὰ ἐπίτασιν.[4] τοῦτο δὲ εἴτε διὰ τοπηγορίαν, εἴτε δείνωσιν, ἢ πραγμάτων ἢ κατασκευῶν ἐπίρρωσιν, εἴτ' ἐποικοδομίαν[5] ἔργων ἢ παθῶν (μυρίαι γὰρ ἰδέαι τῶν αὐξήσεων) γίνοιτο, χρὴ γινώσκειν ὅμως τὸν ῥήτορα, ὡς οὐδὲν ἂν τούτων καθ' αὑτὸ συσταίη χωρὶς ὕψους τέλειον, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἐν οἴκτοις ἄρα νὴ Δία ἢ ἐν εὐτελισμοῖς, τῶν δ'

[1] <ἂν> add. Ruhnken.

[2] <εἰς> add. Roberts.

[3] *συνοικοδομούμενα* K marg., Manutius: P has *συνοικονομούμενα*.

[4] *ἐπίτασιν* Wilamowitz, for *ἐπίβασιν*.

[5] *ἐποικοδομίαν* K marg., Portus: P has *ἐποικονομίαν*.

almost stamped on the diction the precise form of the danger—"swept out from under the jaws of destruction." Comparable to this is the passage of Archilochus about the shipwreck[a] and the description of the arrival of the news in Demosthenes. "Now it was evening," etc.[b] What they have done is to clean up, as it were, the very best of the main points, and to fit them together, allowing nothing affected or undignified or pedantic to intervene. These things ruin the whole, by introducing, as it were, gaps and crevices into masses which are built together, walled in by their mutual relationships.

11. Closely allied to the merits set out above is what is called amplification. Whenever the subject matter and the issues admit of several fresh starts and halting-places from section to section, then one great phrase after another is wheeled into place with increasing force. This may be done either by the development of a commonplace, or by exaggeration, or by laying stress on facts or arguments, or by careful build-up of actions or feelings. There are indeed countless kinds of amplification. Still the speaker must recognize that none of these methods can achieve its goal on its own, without sublimity. One may indeed very well make an exception where the effect required is one of commiseration or depreciation, but in

[a] Archilochus frr. 105–6 West.

[b] *De corona* 169: "Now it was evening, and there came one with a message for the *prytaneis*, that Elatea had fallen"; there follows a vivid description of the ensuing panic at Athens. Elatea fell to Philip late in 339.

ἄλλων αὐξητικῶν ὅτου περ ἂν τὸ ὑψηλὸν ἀφέλῃς, ὡς ψυχὴν ἐξαιρήσεις σώματος· εὐθὺς γὰρ ἀτονεῖ καὶ κενοῦται τὸ ἔμπρακτον αὐτῶν μὴ τοῖς ὕψεσι συν-
3 επιρρωννύμενον. ᾗ μέντοι διαφέρει τοῦ ἀρτίως εἰρημένου τὰ νῦν παραγγελλόμενα (περιγραφὴ γάρ τις ἦν ἐκεῖνο τῶν ἄκρων λημμάτων καὶ εἰς ἑνότητα σύνταξις) καὶ τίνι καθόλου τῶν αὐξήσεων παραλλάττει τὰ ὕψη, τῆς σαφηνείας αὐτῆς ἕνεκα συντόμως διοριστέον.

12. Ὁ μὲν οὖν τῶν τεχνογράφων ὅρος ἔμοιγ' οὐκ ἀρεστός. αὔξησίς ἐστι, φασί, λόγος μέγεθος περιτιθεὶς τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις· δύναται γὰρ ἀμέλει καὶ ὕψους καὶ πάθους καὶ τρόπων εἶναι κοινὸς οὗτος ὅρος, ἐπειδὴ κἀκεῖνα τῷ λόγῳ περιτίθησι ποιόν τι μέγεθος. ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνεται ταῦτα ἀλλήλων παραλλάττειν, ᾗ κεῖται τὸ μὲν ὕψος ἐν διάρματι, ἡ δ' αὔξησις καὶ ἐν πλήθει· δι' ὃ κεῖνο μὲν κἂν νοήματι ἑνὶ πολλάκις, ἡ δὲ πάντως μετὰ ποσότητος καὶ περιου-
2 σίας τινὸς ὑφίσταται. καὶ ἔστιν ἡ αὔξησις, ὡς τύπῳ περιλαβεῖν, συμπλήρωσις ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐμφερομένων τοῖς πράγμασι μορίων καὶ τόπων, ἰσχυροποιοῦσα τῇ ἐπιμονῇ τὸ κατεσκευασμένον, ταύτῃ τῆς πίστεως διεστῶσα, ὅτι ἡ μὲν τὸ ζητούμενον ἀποδεί<κνυσιν>[1] . . .

[1] The completion of the word is due to Manutius.

all other forms of amplification to remove the touch of sublimity is like taking soul from body. For their practical effect instantly loses its vigour and substance if it is not reinforced by the strength of the sublime. But what is the difference between this topic of advice and what we discussed just now, namely the delimitation and unifying arrangement of vital points? What in general is the distinction between instances of amplification and those of sublimity? I must define these matters briefly in order to make my position clear.

12. The definition given by writers on the art of rhetoric does not satisfy me. Amplification, they say, is language which invests the subject with grandeur.[a] Now that definition could obviously serve just as well for the sublime, the emotional, and the metaphorical style, since these also invest the language with some quality of grandeur. But in my view they are each distinct. Sublimity lies in elevation, amplification rather in amount; and so you often find sublimity in a single idea, whereas amplification always goes with quantity and a certain degree of redundance. To give a rough definition, amplification consists in accumulating all the aspects and topics inherent in the subject and thus strengthening the argument by dwelling upon it. Therein it differs from proof, which demonstrates the required point . . .

[*Two pages are lost here.*]

[a] Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 1.9.1368a27) makes the point that amplification is most appropriate to epideictic speeches, because the facts are already admitted, and what remains as the speaker's task is to add grandeur and beauty.

3 . . . πλουσιώτατα, καθάπερ τι πέλαγος, εἰς ἀνα-
πεπταμένον κέχυται πολλαχῇ μέγεθος. ὅθεν οἶμαι
κατὰ λόγον ὁ μὲν ῥήτωρ ἅτε παθητικώτερος πολὺ τὸ
διάπυρον ἔχει καὶ θυμικῶς ἐκφλεγόμενον, ὁ δὲ καθε-
στὼς ἐν ὄγκῳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σεμνότητι οὐκ
4 ἔψυκται μέν, ἀλλ' οὐχ οὕτως ἐπέστραπται.[1] οὐ κατ'
ἄλλα δέ τινα ἢ ταῦτα, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, φίλτατε Τερεν-
τιανέ, (λέγω δέ, <εἰ>[2] καὶ ἡμῖν ὡς Ἕλλησιν ἐφεῖταί
τι γινώσκειν) καὶ ὁ Κικέρων τοῦ Δημοσθένους ἐν
τοῖς μεγέθεσι παραλλάττει. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ὕψει τὸ
πλέον ἀποτόμῳ, ὁ δὲ Κικέρων ἐν χύσει· καὶ ὁ μὲν
ἡμέτερος διὰ τὸ μετὰ βίας ἕκαστα ἔτι δὲ τάχους
ῥώμης δεινότητος οἷον καίειν τε ἅμα καὶ διαρπάζειν
σκηπρῷ τινι παρεικάζοιτ' ἂν ἢ κεραυνῷ· ὁ δὲ Κικέ-
ρων ὡς ἀμφιλαφής τις ἐμπρησμὸς οἶμαι πάντη
νέμεται καὶ ἀνειλεῖται, πολὺ ἔχων καὶ ἐπίμονον ἀεὶ
τὸ καῖον καὶ διακληρονομούμενον ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοίως ἐν
5 αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἀνατρεφόμενον. ἀλλὰ
ταῦτα μὲν ὑμεῖς ἂν ἄμεινον ἐπικρίνοιτε, καιρὸς δὲ
τοῦ Δημοσθενικοῦ μὲν ὕψους καὶ ὑπερτεταμένου ἔν
τε ταῖς δεινώσεσι καὶ τοῖς σφοδροῖς πάθεσι καὶ
ἔνθα δεῖ τον ἀκροατὴν τὸ σύνολον ἐκπλῆξαι, τῆς δὲ
χύσεως ὅπου χρὴ καταντλῆσαι· τοπηγορίαις τε γὰρ
καὶ ἐπιλόγοις κατὰ τὸ πλέον καὶ παρεκβάσεσι καὶ
τοῖς φραστικοῖς ἅπασι καὶ ἐπιδεικτικοῖς, ἱστορίαις
τε καὶ φυσιολογίαις, καὶ οὐκ ὀλίγοις ἄλλοις μέρεσιν
ἁρμόδιος.

13. Ὅτι μέντοι ὁ Πλάτων (ἐπάνειμι γάρ) τοιούτῳ

. . . very rich indeed: like a sea, often flooding a vast expanse of grandeur. I should say then that in point of style the orator, being more emotional, has abundant warmth and passionate glow, whereas Plato, steady in his majestic and stately dignity, is less intense, though of course by no means frigid. It is in the very same respect—so I feel, my dear Terentianus, if indeed we Greeks may be allowed an opinion—that Cicero differs from Demosthenes in his grand effects. Demosthenes' strength is usually in rugged sublimity, Cicero's in diffusion. Our countryman with his violence, yes, and his speed, his force, his terrific power of rhetoric, burns, as it were, and scatters everything before him, and may therefore be compared to a flash of lightning or a thunderbolt. Cicero seems to me like a widespread conflagration, rolling along and devouring all around it: his is a strong and steady fire, its flames duly distributed, now here, now there, and fed by fresh supplies of fuel. You Romans, of course, can form a better judgement on this question, but clearly the opportunity for Demosthenes' sublimity and nervous force comes in his intensity and violent emotion, and in passages where it is necessary to amaze the audience; whereas diffuseness is in place when you need to overwhelm them with a flood of rhetoric. The latter then mostly suits the treatment of a commonplace, a peroration, a digression, and all descriptive and epideictic passages, as well as historical and scientific contexts, and many other types of writing.

13. However, to return to Plato, though the stream of

---

[1] Bentley conjectured *ἀπαστράπτει*, "flashes like lightning."
[2] <*εἰ*> add. K marg., Manutius.

τινὶ χεύματι ἀψοφητὶ ῥέων οὐδὲν ἧττον μεγεθύνεται, ἀνεγνωκὼς τὰ ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ τὸν τύπον οὐκ ἀγνοεῖς. "οἱ ἄρα φρονήσεως," φησί, "καὶ ἀρετῆς ἄπειροι εὐωχίαις δὲ καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀεὶ συνόντες κάτω ὡς ἔοικε φέρονται καὶ ταύτῃ πλανῶνται διὰ βίου, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἄνω οὔτ' ἀνέβλεψαν πώποτε οὔτ' ἀνηνέχθησαν οὐδὲ βεβαίου τε καὶ καθαρᾶς ἡδονῆς ἐγεύσαντο, ἀλλὰ βοσκημάτων δίκην κάτω ἀεὶ βλέποντες καὶ κεκυφότες εἰς γῆν καὶ εἰς τραπέζας βόσκονται χορταζόμενοι καὶ ὀχεύοντες, καὶ ἕνεκα τῆς τούτων πλεονεξίας λακτίζοντες καὶ κυρίττοντες ἀλλήλους σιδηροῖς κέρασι καὶ ὁπλαῖς ἀποκτιννύουσι δι' ἀπληστίαν."

2 Ἐνδείκνυται δ' ἡμῖν οὗτος ἀνήρ, εἰ βουλοίμεθα μὴ κατολιγωρεῖν, ὡς καὶ ἄλλη τις παρὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ὁδὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλὰ τείνει. ποία δὲ καὶ τίς αὕτη; τῶν ἔμπροσθεν μεγάλων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν μίμησίς τε καὶ ζήλωσις. καί γε τούτου, φίλτατε, ἀπριὲξ ἐχώμεθα τοῦ σκοποῦ· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίῳ θεοφοροῦνται πνεύματι τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὃν καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν λόγος ἔχει τρίποδι πλησιάζουσαν, ἔνθα ῥῆγμά ἐστι γῆς ἀναπνέον[1] ὥς φασιν ἀτμὸν ἔνθεον, αὐτόθεν ἐγκύμονα τῆς δαιμονίου καθισταμένην δυνάμεως παραυτίκα χρησμῳδεῖν κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν· οὕτως ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μεγαλοφυΐας εἰς τὰς

[1] *ἀναπνέον* Manutius for *ἀναπνεῖν* P.

[a] *Theaetetus* 144B.

his words flows as noiselessly as oil,[a] he none the less attains sublimity. You have read the *Republic* and you know the sort of thing. "Those who have then no experience," he says, "of wisdom or of goodness, living always amid banquets and other such festivities, are seemingly borne downwards and there they wander all their lives. They have never yet raised their eyes to the truth, never been carried upwards, never tasted true, abiding pleasure. They are like so many cattle; stooping downwards, with their eyes always bent on the earth and on their dinner tables, they feed and fatten and breed, and so greedy are they for these enjoyments that they kick and butt with hooves and horns of iron and kill each other for insatiate desire."[b]

Here is an author who shows us, if we will condescend to see, that there is another road, besides those we have mentioned, which leads to sublimity. What and what manner of road is this? Zealous imitation of the great prose writers and poets of the past. That is the aim, dear friend; let us hold to it with all our might. For many are carried away by the inspiration of another, just as the story runs that the Pythian priestess on approaching the tripod where there is, they say, a rift in the earth, exhaling divine vapour,[c] thereby becomes impregnated with the divine power and is at once inspired to utter oracles; so, too, from the natural genius of those old writers there

[b] *Republic* 9.586A, with some changes and omissions.

[c] The theory that the prophetic power of Delphi was due to such an intoxicating vapour or *pneuma* was widely held in antiquity, but the geology of Delphi lends it no support and no "rift in the earth" has been identified.

τῶν ζηλουντων ἐκείνους ψυχὰς ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερῶν στομίων ἀπόρροιαί τινες φέρονται, ὑφ' ὧν ἐπιπνεόμενοι καὶ οἱ μὴ λίαν φοιβαστικοὶ τῷ ἑτέρων συνενθουσιῶσι μεγέθει. μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὁμηρικώτατος ἐγένετο; Στησίχορος ἔτι πρότερον ὅ τε Ἀρχίλοχος, πάντων δὲ τούτων μάλιστα ὁ Πλάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁμηρικοῦ κείνου νάματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὅσας παρατροπὰς ἀποχετευσάμενος. καὶ ἴσως ἡμῖν ἀποδείξεων ἔδει, εἰ μὴ τὰ ἐπ' εἴδους καὶ οἱ περὶ Ἀμμώνιον ἐκλέξαντες ἀνέγραψαν. ἔστιν δ' οὐ κλοπὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἠθῶν[1] ἢ[2] πλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις. καὶ οὐδ' ἂν ἐπακμάσαι[3] μοι δοκεῖ τηλικαῦτά τινα τοῖς τῆς φιλοσοφίας δόγμασι καὶ εἰς ποιητικὰς ὕλας πολλαχοῦ συνεμβῆναι καὶ φράσεις, εἰ μὴ περὶ πρωτείων νὴ Δία παντὶ θυμῷ πρὸς Ὅμηρον, ὡς ἀνταγωνιστὴς νέος πρὸς ἤδη τεθαυμασμένον, ἴσως μὲν φιλονεικότερον καὶ οἱονεὶ διαδορατιζόμενος, οὐκ ἀνωφελῶς δ' ὅμως διηριστεύετο. "ἀγαθὴ" γὰρ κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον "ἔρις ἥδε βροτοῖσι." καὶ τῷ ὄντι καλὸς οὗτος καὶ ἀξιονικότατος εὐκλείας ἀγών τε καὶ στέφανος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡττᾶσθαι τῶν προγενεστέρων οὐκ ἄδοξον.

[1] εἰδῶν Toll. [2] ἡ Jahn: ἢ P: ᾗ Fyfe.
[3] ἐπανθίσαι Bühler.

---

[a] Stesichorus' lyrics were largely epic in theme and language, while Archilochus' vigorous iambics had been compared with Homer by earlier critics (Heraclides Ponticus wrote on "Homer and Archilochus," but the contents of the book are not known).

flows into the hearts of their admirers as it were an emanation from those holy mouths. Inspired by this, even those who are not easily moved to prophecy share the enthusiasm of these others' grandeur. Was Herodotus alone Homeric in the highest degree? No, there was Stesichorus at a still earlier date and Archilochus too,[a] and above all others Plato,[b] who drew off for his own use ten thousand runnels from the great Homeric spring. We might need to give instances, had not people like Ammonius[c] drawn up a collection. Such borrowing is no theft; it is rather like the reproduction of good character by sculptures or other works of art.[d] So many of these qualities would never have flourished among Plato's philosophic tenets, nor would he have entered so often into the subjects and language of poetry, had he not striven, with heart and soul, to contest the prize with Homer, like a young antagonist with one who had already won his spurs, perhaps in too keen emulation, longing as it were to break a lance, and yet always to good purpose; for, as Hesiod says, "Good is this strife for mankind."[e] Fair indeed is the crown, and the fight for fame well worth the winning, where even to be worsted by our forerunners is not without glory.

[b] Ancient critics saw resemblances between Plato and Homer in grandeur, character-drawing, and psychological theory. It is curious that the third-century Longinus (F15 Prickard) actually says: "Plato is the first who best transferred Homeric grandeur (ὄγκον) into prose." Cf. Introduction.

[c] A pupil of Aristarchus, who wrote on Plato's debt to Homer.

[d] Or (reading ᾗ for ἡ): "an impression taken from good characters, sculptures, or other works of art."

[e] Hesiod, *Works and Days* 24.

14. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς, ἡνίκ' ἂν διαπονῶμεν ὑψηγορίας τι καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνης δεόμενον, καλὸν ἀναπλάττεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς, πῶς ἂν εἰ τύχοι ταὐτὸ τοῦθ' Ὅμηρος εἶπεν, πῶς δ' ἂν Πλάτων ἢ Δημοσθένης ὕψωσαν ἢ ἐν ἱστορίᾳ Θουκυδίδης. προσπίπτοντα γὰρ ἡμῖν κατὰ ζῆλον ἐκεῖνα τὰ πρόσωπα καὶ οἷον διαπρέποντα τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνοίσει πως πρὸς
2 τὰ ἀνειδωλοποιούμενα μέτρα· ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον, εἰ κἀκεῖνο τῇ διανοίᾳ προσυπογράφοιμεν, πῶς ἂν τόδε τι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ λεγόμενον παρὼν Ὅμηρος ἤκουσεν ἢ Δημοσθένης, ἢ πῶς ἂν ἐπὶ τούτῳ διετέθησαν; τῷ γὰρ ὄντι μέγα τὸ ἀγώνισμα, τοιοῦτον ὑποτίθεσθαι τῶν ἰδίων λόγων δικαστήριον καὶ θέατρον καὶ ἐν τηλικούτοις ἥρωσι κριταῖς τε καὶ μάρτυσιν ὑπέχειν
3 τῶν γραφομένων εὐθύνας πεπαῖχθαι.[1] πλέον δὲ τούτων παρορμητικόν, εἰ προστιθείης πῶς ἂν ἐμοῦ ταῦτα γράψαντος ὁ μετ' ἐμὲ πᾶς ἀκούσειεν αἰών; εἰ δέ τις αὐτόθεν φοβοῖτο, μὴ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου καὶ χρόνου φθέγξαιτό τι ὑπερήμερον, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ συλλαμβανόμενα ὑπὸ τῆς τούτου ψυχῆς ἀτελῆ καὶ τυφλὰ ὥσπερ ἀμβλοῦσθαι, πρὸς τὸν τῆς ὑστεροφημίας ὅλως μὴ τελεσφορούμενα χρόνον.

15. Ὄγκου καὶ μεγαληγορίας καὶ ἀγῶνος ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὦ νεανία, καὶ αἱ φαντασίαι παρασκευαστικώταται· οὕτω γοῦν <ἡμεῖς>[2] εἰδωλοποιΐας <δ'>[3] αὐτὰς ἔνιοι λέγουσι. καλεῖται μὲν γὰρ κοινῶς φαντασία πᾶν τὸ ὁπωσοῦν ἐννόημα γεννητικὸν λόγου παριστάμενον, ἤδη δ' ἐπὶ τούτων κεκράτηκεν τοὔ-

14. We too, then, when we are working at some passage that demands sublimity of thought and expression, should do well to form in our hearts the question, "How might Homer have said this same thing, how would Plato or Demosthenes or (in history) Thucydides have made it sublime?" Emulation will bring those great characters before our eyes, and their shining presence will lead our thoughts to the ideal standards of perfection. Still more will this be so, if we also try to imagine to ourselves: "How would Homer or Demosthenes, had either been present, have listened to this passage of mine? How would that passage have affected them?" Great indeed is the ordeal, if we suppose such a jury and audience as this to listen to our own utterances and make believe that we are submitting our work to the scrutiny of such heroes as witnesses and judges. Even more stimulating would it be to add, "If I write this, how would all posterity receive it?" But if a man shrinks at the very thought of saying anything that is going to outlast his own life and time, then must all the conceptions of that man's mind be like some blind, half-formed embryo, all too abortive for the life of posthumous fame.

15. Weight, grandeur, and urgency in writing are very largely produced, dear young friend, by the use of "visualizations" (*phantasiai*). That at least is what I call them; others call them "image productions." For the term *phantasia* is applied in general to an idea which enters the mind from any source and engenders speech, but the word has now come to be used predominantly of

---

[1] πεπεῖσθαι Reiske.

[2,3] These changes are by Russell (1964).

νομα, ὅταν ἃ λέγεις ὑπ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ πάθους βλέπειν δοκῇς καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν τιθῇς τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.
2 ὡς δ' ἕτερόν τι ἡ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία βούλεται καὶ ἕτερον ἡ παρὰ ποιηταῖς, οὐκ ἂν λάθοι σε, οὐδ' ὅτι τῆς μὲν ἐν ποιήσει τέλος ἐστὶν ἔκπληξις, τῆς δ' ἐν λόγοις ἐνάργεια, ἀμφότεραι δ' ὅμως τό τε <παθητικὸν>[1] ἐπιζητοῦσι καὶ τὸ συγκεκινημένον.

ὦ μῆτερ, ἱκετεύω σε, μὴ 'πίσειέ μοι
τὰς αἱματωπούς καὶ δρακοντώδεις κόρας·
αὗται γάρ, αὗται πλησίον θρώσκουσί μου.

καὶ

οἴμοι, κτανεῖ με· ποῖ φύγω;

ἐνταῦθ' ὁ ποιητὴς αὐτὸς[2] εἶδεν Ἐρινύας, ὃ δὲ ἐφαντάσθη μικροῦ δεῖν θεάσασθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας
3 ἠνάγκασεν. ἔστι μὲν οὖν φιλοπονώτατος ὁ Εὐριπίδης δύο ταυτὶ πάθη, μανίας τε καὶ ἔρωτας, ἐκτραγῳδῆσαι, κἀν τούτοις ὡς οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τισιν ἑτέροις ἐπιτυχέστατος, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπιτίθεσθαι φαντασίαις οὐκ ἄτολμος. ἥκιστά γέ τοι μεγαλοφυὴς ὢν ὅμως τὴν αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ φύσιν ἐν πολλοῖς γενέσθαι τραγικὴν προσηνάγκασεν καὶ παρ' ἕκαστα ἐπὶ τῶν μεγεθῶν, ὡς ὁ ποιητής,

[1] add. Kayser.
[2] Manutius added <οὐκ>: "the poet did *not* see Furies."

---

[a] Euripides, *Orestes* 255–7, from the classic scene in which

passages where, inspired by strong emotion, you seem to see what you describe and bring it vividly before the eyes of your audience. That *phantasia* means one thing in oratory and another in poetry you will yourself detect, and also that the object of the poetical form of it is to enthral, and that of the prose form to present things vividly, though both indeed aim at the emotional and the excited.

> Mother, I beg you, do not drive against me
> These snake-like women with blood-reddened
> eyes.
> See there! See there! They leap upon me close.[a]

And

> Ah, she will slay me, whither shall I flee?[b]

In these passages the poet himself saw Furies and compelled the audience almost to see what he had visualized. Now Euripides makes his greatest efforts in presenting these two emotions, madness and love, in tragic guise, and succeeds more brilliantly with these emotions than, I think, with any others; not that he lacks enterprise to attack other forms of visualization as well. While his natural genius is certainly not sublime, yet in many places he forces it into the tragic mould and invariably in his grand passages, as the poet says,

[a] Orestes has a madman's vision of Clytemnestra sending the Erinyes against him.

[b] Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 291: a herdsman describes to Iphigenia the mad behaviour and words of the man he has seen on the beach, who turns out to be Orestes, who is experiencing the same delusion of attack by the Erinyes avenging his mother.

οὐρῇ δὲ πλευράς τε καὶ ἰσχίον ἀμφοτέρωθεν
μαστίεται, ἐὲ δ' αὐτὸν ἐποτρύνει μαχέσασθαι.

4 τῷ γοῦν Φαέθοντι παραδιδοὺς τὰς ἡνίας ὁ Ἥλιος

ἔλα δὲ μήτε Λιβυκὸν αἰθέρ' εἰσβαλών·
κρᾶσιν γὰρ ὑγρὰν οὐκ ἔχων ἀψῖδα σὴν
καίων[1] διήσει . . .

φησίν, εἶθ' ἑξῆς

ἴει δ' ἐφ' ἑπτὰ Πλειάδων ἔχων δρόμον.
τοσαῦτ' ἀκούσας παῖς ἔμαρψεν ἡνίας·
κρούσας δὲ πλευρὰ πτεροφόρων ὀχημάτων
μεθῆκεν, αἱ δ' ἔπταντ' ἐπ' αἰθέρος πτύχας.
πατὴρ δ' ὄπισθε νῶτα σειρίου βεβὼς
ἵππευε παῖδα νουθετῶν· ἐκεῖσ' ἔλα,
τῇδε στρέφ' ἅρμα, τῇδε.

ἆρ' οὐκ ἂν εἴποις, ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ γράφοντος συνεπιβαίνει τοῦ ἅρματος καὶ συγκινδυνεύουσα τοῖς ἵπποις συνεπτέρωται; οὐ γὰρ ἄν, εἰ μὴ τοῖς οὐρανίοις ἐκείνοις ἔργοις ἰσοδρομοῦσα ἐφέρετο, τοιαῦτ' ἄν ποτε ἐφαντάσθη. ὅμοια καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς Κασσάνδρας αὐτῷ

[1] Richards, for P's κάτω.

His tail at his ribs and his flanks now lashes on this,
now on that side,
Ever he spurs himself on to share in the joys of the
battle.[a]

For instance, when Helios hands over the reins to Phaethon:[b]

"And do not drive into the Libyan sky.
Its torrid air with no damp humour tempered
Will burn your wheel and melt it."

And he goes on,

"But toward the seven Pleiads hold your course."
This heard, young Phaethon caught up the reins,
Slashed at the flanks of his wing-wafted team,
And launched them flying to the cloudy vales.
Behind, his sire, astride the Dog-star's back,
Rode, schooling thus his son. "Now, drive on there,
Now this way wheel your car, this way."

Would you not say that the writer's soul is aboard the car, and takes wing to share the horses' peril? Never could it have visualized such things, had it not run beside those heavenly bodies. You find the same sort of thing in his Cassandra's speech:

[a] *Iliad* 20.170, describing a wounded lion.

[b] The following passages are from Euripides' *Phaethon* (fr. 779 Nauck[2], see J. Diggle, *Euripides' Phaethon*, Cambridge 1970, lines 168–77). They come from a messenger's speech relating Phaethon's fatal ride in the Sun god's chariot.

ἀλλ' ὦ φίλιπποι Τρῶες.

τοῦ δ' Αἰσχύλου φαντασίαις ἐπιτολμῶντος ἡρωϊκωτάταις, ὥσπερ καὶ <οἱ>[1] Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας παρ' αὐτῷ

ἄνδρες (φησίν) ἑπτὰ θούριοι λοχαγέται,
ταυροσφαγοῦντες εἰς μελάνδετον σάκος
καὶ θιγγάνοντες χερσὶ ταυρείου φόνου
Ἄρη τ' Ἐνυὼ καὶ φιλαίματον Φόβον
ὁρκωμότησαν

τὸν ἴδιον αὐτῶν[2] πρὸς ἀλλήλους δίχα οἴκτου συνομνύμενοι θάνατον, ἐνίοτε μέντοι ἀκατεργάστους καὶ οἱονεὶ ποκοειδεῖς τὰς ἐννοίας καὶ ἀμαλάκτους φέροντος, ὅμως ἑαυτὸν ὁ Εὐριπίδης κἀκείνοις ὑπὸ φιλοτι-
6 μίας τοῖς κινδύνοις προσβιβάζει. καὶ παρὰ μὲν Αἰσχύλῳ παραδόξως τὰ τοῦ Λυκούργου βασίλεια κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ Διονύσου θεοφορεῖται,

ἐνθουσιᾷ δὴ δῶμα, βακχεύει στέγη·

ὁ δ' Εὐριπίδης τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦθ' ἑτέρως ἐφηδύνας ἐξεφώνησε,

πᾶν δὲ συνεβάκχευ' ὄρος.

[1] add. Morus; K marg. has ὥσπερ οἱ.
[2] Faber: P has αὐτῶν.

---

[a] Euripides fr. 935 Nauck[2]. This may come from the *Alexandros*, and may have to do with Cassandra's warning against the

O you horse-loving Trojans[a]

And whereas when Aeschylus ventures upon heroic imaginings, he is like his own "Seven against Thebes," where

> Seven resistless captains o'er a shield
> Black-bound with hide have slit a bullock's throat,
> And dipped their fingers in the bullock's blood,
> Swearing a mighty oath by War and Havoc
> And Panic, bloodshed's lover —[b]

and all pledge themselves to each other to die "apart from pity," and though he sometimes introduces unworked ideas, all woolly, as it were, and tangled, Euripides' competitiveness leads him also to embark on the same perilous path. Aeschylus uses a startling phrase of Lycurgus's palace, magically possessed at the appearance of Dionysus,

> The palace is possessed, the roof turns bacchanal.[c]

Euripides expressed the same idea differently, softening it down,

> And all the mountain
> Turned bacchanal with them.[d]

Trojan Horse; if so, "horse-loving" is an apt taunt. Presumably Longinus means us to recall more of the speech than these opening words. [b] *Seven against Thebes* 42–6: "apart from pity" comes from the same passage (51). [c] Aeschylus fr. 58 Radt, from the *Lycurgeia*, the trilogy dealing with Lycurgus' resistance to the cult of Dionysus in Thrace, a parallel theme to that of Euripides' *Bacchae*, where Pentheus of Thebes vainly resists the god. [d] Euripides, *Bacchae* 726.

7 ἄκρως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ θνῄσκοντος Οἰδίπου καὶ ἑαυτὸν μετὰ διοσημείας τινὸς θάπτοντος πεφάνταται, καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόπλουν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπὶ τἀχιλλέως προφαινομένου τοῖς ἀναγομένοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ τάφου, ἣν οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τις ὄψιν ἐναργέστερον εἰδωλοποίησε Σιμωνίδου· πάντα δ' ἀμήχανον
8 παρατίθεσθαι. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς μυθικωτέραν ἔχει τὴν ὑπερέκπτωσιν, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ πάντη τὸ πιστὸν ὑπεραίρουσαν, τῆς δὲ ῥητορικῆς φαντασίας κάλλιστον ἀεὶ τὸ ἔμπρακτον καὶ ἐνάληθες. δειναὶ δὲ καὶ ἔκφυλοι αἱ παραβάσεις, ἡνίκ' ἂν ᾖ ποιητικὸν τοῦ λόγου καὶ μυθῶδες τὸ πλάσμα καὶ εἰς πᾶν προεκπῖπτον[1] τὸ ἀδύνατον, ὡς ἤδη νὴ Δία καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς δεινοὶ ῥήτορες, καθάπερ οἱ τραγῳδοί, βλέπουσιν Ἐρινύας καὶ οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο μαθεῖν οἱ γενναῖοι δύνανται, ὅτι ὁ λέγων Ὀρέστης

> μέθες· μί' οὖσα τῶν ἐμῶν Ἐρινύων
> μέσον μ' ὀχμάζεις, ὡς βάλῃς ἐς τάρταρον

φαντάζεται ταῦθ' ὅτι μαίνεται.

9 Τί οὖν ἡ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία δύναται; πολλὰ μὲν ἴσως καὶ ἄλλα τοῖς λόγοις ἐναγώνια καὶ ἐμπαθῆ προσεισφέρειν, κατακιρναμένη μέντοι ταῖς πραγματικαῖς ἐπιχειρήσεσιν οὐ πείθει τὸν ἀκροατὴν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ δουλοῦται. "καὶ μὴν εἴ τις," φησίν, "αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα κραυγῆς ἀκούσειε πρὸ τῶν δικα-

[1] So Morus, for προσεκπῖπτον

[a] *Oedipus at Colonus* 1586–1666.

Sophocles too describes with superb visualization the dying Oedipus conducting his own burial amid strange portents in the sky;[a] and Achilles at the departure of the Greeks, when he appears above his tomb to those embarking,[b] a scene which nobody perhaps has depicted so vividly as Simonides.[c] But to give all the instances would be endless. However, as I said, these examples from poetry show an exaggeration which belongs to fable and far exceeds the limits of credibility, whereas the most perfect effect of visualization in oratory is always one of reality and truth. Transgressions of this rule have a strange, outlandish air, when the texture of the speech is poetical and fabulous and deviates into all sorts of impossibilities. For instance, our wonderful modern orators—god help us!—are like so many tragedians in seeing Furies, and the fine fellows cannot even understand that when Orestes says,

> Let go! Of my own Furies you are one
> And grip my waist to cast me down to Hell,[d]

he only imagines that, because he is mad.

What then is the use of visualization in oratory? It may be said generally to introduce a great deal of excitement and emotion into one's speeches, but when combined with factual arguments it not only convinces the audience, it positively masters them. Take Demosthenes: "And yet, suppose that at this very moment we were to hear an uproar in front of the law courts and someone

[b] In *Polyxena*, fr. 523 Radt.

[c] D. A. Campbell (ed.), *Greek Lyric* III (Loeb Classical Library) Simonides fr. 557 (= fr. 52 Page).

[d] Euyripides, *Orestes* 264–5.

στηρίων, εἶτ' εἴποι τις, ὡς ἀνέῳκται τὸ δεσμωτήριον, οἱ δὲ δεσμῶται φεύγουσιν, οὐθεὶς οὕτως οὔτε γέρων οὔτε νέος ὀλίγωρός ἐστιν, ὃς οὐχὶ βοηθήσει καθ' ὅσον δύναται· εἰ δὲ δή τις εἴποι παρελθών, ὡς ὁ τούτους ἀφεὶς οὗτός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ λόγου τυχὼν παραυτίκ' ἂν ἀπόλοιτο." ὡς νὴ Δία καὶ ὁ Ὑπερείδης κατηγορούμενος, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς δούλους μετὰ τὴν ἥτταν ἐλευθέρους ἐψηφίσατο, "τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα," εἶπεν, "οὐχ ὁ ῥήτωρ ἔγραψεν ἀλλ' ἡ ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχη." ἅμα γὰρ τῷ πραγματικῶς ἐπιχειρεῖν ὁ ῥήτωρ πεφάνταται, διὸ καὶ τὸν τοῦ πείθειν ὅρον ὑπερβέβηκεν τῷ
11 λήμματι. φύσει δέ πως ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἅπασιν ἀεὶ τοῦ κρείττονος ἀκούομεν, ὅθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποδεικτικοῦ περιελκόμεθα εἰς τὸ κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐκπληκτικόν, ᾧ τὸ πραγματικὸν ἐγκρύπτεται περιλαμπόμενον. καὶ τοῦτ' οὐκ ἀπεικότως πάσχομεν· δυεῖν γὰρ συνταττομένων ὑφ' ἓν ἀεὶ τὸ κρεῖττον εἰς ἑαυτὸ τὴν θατέρου δύναμιν περισπᾷ.

12 Τοσαῦτα περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς νοήσεις ὑψηλῶν καὶ ὑπὸ μεγαλοφροσύνης <ἢ>[1] μιμήσεως ἢ φαντασίας ἀπογεννωμένων ἀρκέσει.

16. Αὐτόθι μέντοι καὶ ὁ περὶ σχημάτων ἐφεξῆς τέτακται τόπος· καὶ γὰρ ταῦτ', ἂν ὃν δεῖ σκευάζηται τρόπον, ὡς ἔφην, οὐκ ἂν ἡ τυχοῦσα μεγέθους εἴη μερίς. οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τὸ πάντα διακριβοῦν πολὺ ἔργον[2] ἐν τῷ παρόντι, μᾶλλον δ' ἀπεριόριστον,

[1] add. Manutius: <ἢ διὰ> Vahlen.
[2] Bühler, for πολύεργον.

were to tell us, 'The prison has been broken open and the prisoners are escaping,' there is no man, old or young, so unheeding that he would not run to give all the assistance in his power. But suppose someone were to come and actually tell us that this was the man who set them free, he would be killed on the moment without a hearing."[a] And then, to be sure, there is Hyperides on his trial, when he had moved the enfranchisement of the slaves after the Athenian reverse. "It was not the speaker that framed this measure, but the battle of Chaeronea."[b] There, besides developing his factual argument the orator has visualized the event and consequently his conception far exceeds the limits of mere persuasion. In all such cases the stronger element seems naturally to catch our ears, so that our attention is drawn from the reasoning to the enthralling effect of the imagination, and the reality is concealed in a halo of brilliance. And this effect on us is natural enough; set two forces side by side and the stronger always absorbs the virtues of the other.

This must suffice for our treatment of sublimity in ideas, as produced by nobility of mind or imitation or visualization.[c]

16. The topic of figures comes next, for these too, if rightly handled, may be, as I said,[d] an important element in the sublime. However, since it would be a long, and indeed an interminable task to treat them all in detail

[a] Demosthenes, *Oration* 24.208. [b] After Philip's victory at Chaeronea (338 B.C.), Hyperides proposed the enfranchisement of slaves, and defended this panic measure, it is said, in these terms: see Rutilius Lupus 1.19, [Plutarch] *Lives of the Ten Orators*, 849A. [c] This summary is puzzling: it omits the contents of chap. 10. [d] In chap. 8.

ὀλίγα τῶν ὅσα μεγαληγορίας ἀποτελεστικὰ τοῦ πιστώσασθαι τὸ προκείμενον ἕνεκα καὶ δὴ διέξιμεν.

2 ἀπόδειξιν ὁ Δημοσθένης ὑπὲρ τῶν πεπολιτευμένων εἰσφέρει. τίς δ' ἦν ἡ κατὰ φύσιν χρῆσις αὐτῆς; "οὐχ ἡμάρτετε, ὦ τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας ἀγῶνα ἀράμενοι· ἔχετε δὲ οἰκεῖα τούτου παραδείγματα· οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἐν Μαραθῶνι ἥμαρτον οὐδ' οἱ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι οὐδ' οἱ ἐν Πλαταιαῖς." ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ καθάπερ ἐμπνευσθεὶς ἐξαίφνης ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ οἱονεὶ φοιβόληπτος γενόμενος τὸν τῶν ἀριστέων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὅρκον ἐξεφώνησεν "οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἡμάρτετε, μὰ τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι προκινδυνεύσαντας," φαίνεται δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ ὁμοτικοῦ σχήματος, ὅπερ ἐνθάδε ἀποστροφὴν ἐγὼ καλῶ, τοὺς μὲν προγόνους ἀποθεώσας, ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς οὕτως ἀποθανόντας ὡς θεοὺς ὀμνύναι παριστάνων, τοῖς δὲ κρίνουσι τὸ τῶν ἐκεῖ προκινδυνευσάντων ἐντιθεὶς φρόνημα, τὴν δὲ τῆς ἀποδείξεως φύσιν μεθεστακὼς εἰς ὑπερβάλλον ὕψος καὶ πάθος καὶ ξένων καὶ ὑπερφυῶν ὅρκων ἀξιοπιστίαν, καὶ ἅμα παιώνειόν τινα καὶ ἀλεξιφάρμακον εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀκουόντων καθιεὶς λόγον, ὡς κουφιζομένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγκωμίων μηδὲν ἔλαττον τῇ μάχῃ τῇ πρὸς Φίλιππον ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς κατὰ Μαραθῶνα καὶ Σαλαμῖνα νικητηρίοις παρίστασθαι φρο-

3 νεῖν· οἷς πᾶσι τοὺς ἀκροατὰς διὰ τοῦ σχηματισμοῦ συναρπάσας ᾤχετο. καίτοι παρὰ τῷ Εὐπόλιδι τοῦ ὅρκου τὸ σπέρμα φασὶν εὑρῆσθαι·

at this point, we will by way of confirmation of our thesis merely run through a few of those which make for grandeur. Demosthenes is producing an argument in defence of his political career. What was the natural way to treat it? "You were not wrong, you who undertook that struggle for the freedom of Greece, and you have proof of this at home, for neither were the men at Marathon misguided nor those at Salamis nor those at Plataea."[a] But when in a sudden moment of inspiration, as if possessed by the divine, he utters his great oath by the champions of Greece, "It cannot be that you were wrong; no, by those who risked their lives at Marathon," then you feel that by employing the single figure of adjuration—which I here call apostrophe—he has deified the ancestors by suggesting that one should swear by men who met such a death, as if they were gods; he has filled his judges with the spirit of those who risked their lives there; he has transformed a demonstrative argument into a passage of transcendent sublimity and emotion, giving it the power of conviction that lies in so strange and startling an oath; and at the same time his words have administered to his hearers a healing medicine, with the result that, relieved by his eulogy, they come to feel as proud of the war with Philip as of their victories at Marathon and Salamis. In all this he is enabled to carry the audience away with him by the use of the figure. True, the germ of the oath is said to have been found in Eupolis:

[a] *De corona* 208. The passage was much admired in antiquity (Quintil. 9.2.62; 12.10.24; Hermogenes, *De ideis* p. 267 Rabe), and Longinus' discussion was highly praised by Dr. Johnson (*Life of Dryden* p. 299, World's Classics edition).

οὐ γὰρ μὰ τὴν Μαραθῶνι τὴν ἐμὴν μάχην
χαίρων τις αὐτῶν τοὐμὸν ἀλγυνεῖ κέαρ.

ἔστι δ' οὐ τὸ ὁπωσοῦν τινὰ ὀμόσαι μέγα, τὸ δὲ ποῦ καὶ πῶς καὶ ἐφ' ὧν καιρῶν καὶ τίνος ἕνεκα. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ μὲν οὐδέν ἐστ' εἰ μὴ ὅρκος, καὶ πρὸς εὐτυχοῦντας ἔτι καὶ οὐ δεομένους παρηγορίας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· ἔτι δ' οὐχὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀπαθανατίσας ὁ ποιητὴς ὤμοσεν, ἵνα τῆς ἐκείνων ἀρετῆς τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἐντέκῃ λόγον ἄξιον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν προκινδυνευσάντων ἐπὶ τὸ ἄψυχον ἀπεπλανήθη, τὴν μάχην. παρὰ δὲ τῷ Δημοσθένει πεπραγμάτευται πρὸς ἡττημένους ὁ ὅρκος, ὡς μὴ Χαιρώνειαν ἔτ' Ἀθηναίοις ἀτύχημα φαίνεσθαι, καὶ ταὐτόν, ὡς ἔφην, ἅμα ἀπόδειξίς ἐστι τοῦ μηδὲν ἡμαρτηκέναι, παράδειγμα, ὅρκων[1] πίστις,
4 ἐγκώμιον, προτροπή. κἀπειδήπερ ὑπήντα τῷ ῥήτορι "λέγεις ἦτταν πολιτευσάμενος, εἶτα νίκας ὀμνύεις;" διὰ ταῦθ' ἑξῆς κανονίζει καὶ δι' ἀσφαλείας ἄγει καὶ[2] ὀνόματα, διδάσκων ὅτι κἂν βακχεύμασι νήφειν ἀναγκαῖον. "τοὺς προκινδυνεύσαντας," φησί, "Μαραθῶνι καὶ τοὺς Σαλαμῖνι καὶ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχήσαντας καὶ τοὺς ἐν Πλαταιαῖς παραταξαμένους." οὐδαμοῦ "νικήσαντας" εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ πάντη τὸ τοῦ τέλους διακέκλοφεν ὄνομα, ἐπειδήπερ ἦν εὐτυχὲς καὶ τοῖς κατὰ Χαιρώνειαν ὑπεναντίον. διόπερ καὶ τὸν ἀκροατὴν φθάνων εὐθὺς ὑποφέρει· "οὓς ἅπαντας

[1] ὅρκων deleted by Kayser.
[2] καὶ <κατ'> Mazzucchi.

No, by the fight I fought at Marathon,
No one of them shall vex me and go free.[a]

But the mere swearing of an oath is not sublime: we must consider the place, the manner, the circumstances, the motive. In Eupolis there is nothing but an oath, and that addressed to Athens, when still in prosperity and needing no consolation. Moreover, the poet's oath does not immortalize the men so as to beget in the audience a true opinion of their worth, but instead he wanders from those who risked their lives to an inanimate object, namely the fight. In Demosthenes the oath is carefully designed to suit the feelings of defeated men, so that the Athenians should no longer regard Chaeronea as a disaster; and it is, as I said, at the same time a proof that no mistake has been made, an example, a sworn confirmation, an encomium, and an exhortation. The orator was faced with the objection, "You are speaking of a reverse due to your policy and then you go swearing by victories," and therefore in the sequel he measures his every word and keeps on the safe side, inculcating the lesson that "in the wildest rite" you must stay sober.[b] "Those who risked their lives," he says, "at Marathon and those who fought on shipboard at Salamis and Artemisium and those who stood in the line at Plataea"—never "those who won the victory." Throughout he cunningly avoids naming the result, because it was a happy one, and the opposite of what happened at Chaeronea. So before his hearers can raise the objection he promptly adds, "To all of these the

[a] From the *Demes* (fr. 106 Kassel-Austin).
[b] A reminiscence of Euripides, *Bacchae* 317.

ἔθαψε δημοσίᾳ" φησίν "ἡ πόλις, Αἰσχίνη, οὐχὶ τοὺς κατορθώσαντας μόνους."

17. Οὐκ ἄξιον ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ τόπου παραλιπεῖν ἔν τι τῶν ἡμῖν τεθεωρημένων, φίλτατε, ἔσται δὲ πάνυ σύντομον, ὅτι φύσει πως συμμαχεῖ τε τῷ ὕψει τὰ σχήματα καὶ πάλιν ἀντισυμμαχεῖται θαυμαστῶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. πῇ δὲ καὶ πῶς; ἐγὼ φράσω. ὕποπτόν ἐστιν ἰδίως τὸ διὰ σχημάτων πανουργεῖν καὶ προσβάλλον ὑπόνοιαν ἐνέδρας ἐπιβουλῆς παραλογισμοῦ, καὶ ταῦθ' ὅταν ᾖ πρὸς κριτὴν κύριον ὁ λόγος, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τυράννους βασιλέας ἡγεμόνας ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς· ἀγανακτεῖ γὰρ εὐθύς, εἰ ὡς παῖς ἄφρων ὑπὸ τεχνίτου ῥήτορος σχηματίοις κατασοφίζεται, καὶ εἰς καταφρόνησιν ἑαυτοῦ λαμβάνων τὸν παραλογισμὸν ἐνίοτε μὲν ἀποθηριοῦται τὸ σύνολον, κἂν ἐπικρατήσῃ δὲ τοῦ θυμοῦ, πρὸς τὴν πειθὼ τῶν λόγων πάντως ἀντιδιατίθεται. διόπερ καὶ τότε ἄριστον δοκεῖ τὸ σχῆμα, ὅταν αὐτὸ τοῦτο διαλανθάνῃ
2 ὅτι σχῆμά ἐστιν. τὸ τοίνυν ὕψος καὶ πάθος τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ σχηματίζειν ὑπονοίας ἀλέξημα καὶ θαυμαστή τις ἐπικουρία καθίσταται, καί πως περιλαμφθεῖσ' ἡ[1] τοῦ πανουργεῖν τέχνη τοῖς κάλλεσι καὶ μεγέθεσι τὸ λοιπὸν δέδυκεν καὶ πᾶσαν ὑποψίαν ἐκπέφευγεν. ἱκανὸν δὲ τεκμήριον τὸ προειρημένον "μὰ τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι." τίνι γὰρ ἐνταῦθ' ὁ ῥήτωρ ἀπέκρυψε τὸ σχῆμα; δῆλον ὅτι τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῷ. σχεδὸν γὰρ ὥσπερ καὶ τἀμυδρὰ φέγγη ἐναφανίζεται τῷ ἡλίῳ περιαυγούμενα, οὕτω τὰ τῆς ῥητορικῆς σοφίσματα

country gave a public funeral, Aeschines, not only to those who were successful."

17. While on this topic I must not omit to mention a view of my own, dear friend, which I will state, however, quite concisely. Figures seem to be natural allies of the sublime and to draw in turn marvellous reinforcement from the alliance. Where and how? I will tell you. There is an inevitable suspicion attaching to the sophisticated use of figures. It gives a suggestion of treachery, craft, fallacy, especially when your speech is addressed to a judge with absolute authority, or still more to a despot, a king, or a ruler in high place. He is promptly indignant that he is being treated like a silly child and outwitted by the figures of a skilled speaker. Construing the fallacy as a personal affront, he sometimes turns downright savage; and even if he controls his feelings, he becomes conditioned against being persuaded by the speech. So we find that a figure is always most effective when it conceals the very fact of its being a figure. Sublimity and emotional intensity are a wonderfully helpful antidote against the suspicion that accompanies the use of figures. The artfulness of the trick is no longer obvious in its brilliant setting of beauty and grandeur, and thus avoids all suspicion. A sufficient instance is that mentioned above, "By those at Marathon." In that case how did the orator conceal the figure? By its very brilliance, of course. Much in the same way that dimmer lights vanish in the surrounding radiance of the sun, so an all-embracing atmosphere of grandeur obscures the rhetorical devices. We see some-

[1] *περιλαμφθεῖσ' ἡ* Bury for *παραληφθεῖσαν* P.

3 ἐξαμαυροῖ περιχυθὲν πάντοθεν τὸ μέγεθος. οὐ πόρρω δ' ἴσως τούτου καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ζωγραφίας τι συμβαίνει· ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κειμένων ἐπιπέδου παραλλήλων ἐν χρώμασι τῆς σκιᾶς τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός, ὅμως προϋπαντᾷ τε τὸ φῶς ταῖς ὄψεσι καὶ οὐ μόνον ἔξοχον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγγυτέρω παρὰ πολὺ φαίνεται. οὐκοῦν καὶ τῶν λόγων τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰ ὕψη, ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν ἐγγυτέρω κείμενα, διά τε φυσικήν τινα συγγένειαν καὶ διὰ λαμπρότητα ἀεὶ τῶν σχημάτων προεμφανίζεται καὶ τὴν τέχνην αὐτῶν ἀποσκιάζει καὶ οἷον ἐν κατακαλύψει τηρεῖ.

18. Τί δ' ἐκεῖνα φῶμεν, τὰς πεύσεις τε καὶ ἐρωτήσεις; ἆρα οὐκ αὐταῖς ταῖς τῶν σχημάτων εἰδοποιΐαις παρὰ πολὺ ἐμπρακτότερα καὶ σοβαρώτερα συντείνει τὰ λεγόμενα; "ἢ βούλεσθε, εἰπέ μοι, περιϊόντες ἀλλήλων πυνθάνεσθαι· λέγεταί τι καινόν; τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο τούτου καινότερον ἢ Μακεδὼν ἀνὴρ καταπολεμῶν τὴν Ἑλλάδα; τέθνηκε Φίλιππος; οὐ μὰ Δί' ἀλλ' ἀσθενεῖ. τί δ' ὑμῖν διαφέρει; καὶ γὰρ ἂν οὗτός τι πάθῃ, ταχέως ὑμεῖς ἕτερον Φίλιππον ποιήσετε." καὶ πάλιν "πλέωμεν ἐπὶ Μακεδονίαν," φησί. "ποῖ δὴ προσορμιούμεθα; ἤρετό τις. εὑρήσει τὰ σαθρὰ τῶν Φιλίππου πραγμάτων αὐτὸς ὁ πόλεμος." ἦν δὲ ἁπλῶς ῥηθὲν τὸ πρᾶγμα τῷ παντὶ καταδεέστερον, νυνὶ δὲ τὸ ἔνθουν καὶ ὀξύρροπον τῆς πεύσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὡς πρὸς ἕτερον ἀνθυπαντᾶν οὐ μόνον ὑψηλότερον ἐποίησε τῷ σχη-
2 ματισμῷ τὸ ῥηθὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ πιστότερον. ἄγει γὰρ τὰ παθητικὰ τότε μᾶλλον, ὅταν αὐτὰ φαίνηται μὴ

thing of the same kind in painting. Though the highlights and shadows lie side by side in the same plane, yet the highlights spring to the eye and seem not only to stand out but to be actually much nearer. So it is in writing. What is sublime and moving lies nearer to our hearts, and thus, partly from a natural affinity, partly from brilliance of effect, it always strikes the eye long before the figures, thus throwing their art into the shade and keeping it hid as it were under a bushel.

18. Now what are we to say of our next subject, the figures of inquiry and interrogation? Is it not just the specific character of these figures which gives the language much greater realism, vigour and tension? "Tell me, my friend, do you all want to go round asking each other 'Is there any news?'[a] For what stranger news could there be than this of a Macedonian conquering Greece? 'Is Philip dead?' 'No, not dead but ill.' What difference does it make to you? Whatever happens to him, you will soon manufacture another Philip for yourselves." Or again: "Let us sail to Macedon. Someone asks me, 'Where on earth shall we land?' Why, the mere course of the war will find out the weak spots in Philip's situation." Here a bare statement would have been utterly inadequate. As it is, the inspiration and quick play of the question and answer, and his way of confronting his own words as if they were someone else's, make the passage, through his use of the figure, not only loftier but also more convincing. For emotion is always more telling when it seems not to be

[a] This and the following passage are loose quotations from the *First Philippic* (Demosthenes, *Oration* 4.10 and 44).

ἐπιτηδεύειν αὐτὸς ὁ λέγων ἀλλὰ γεννᾶν ὁ καιρός, ἡ δ' ἐρώτησις ἡ εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπόκρισις μιμεῖται τοῦ πάθους τὸ ἐπίκαιρον. σχεδὸν γὰρ ὡς οἱ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐρωτώμενοι παροξυνθέντες ἐκ τοῦ παραχρῆμα πρὸς τὸ λεχθὲν ἐναγωνίως καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας ἀνθυπαντῶσιν, οὕτως τὸ σχῆμα τῆς πεύσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως εἰς τὸ δοκεῖν ἕκαστον τῶν ἐσκεμμένων ἐξ ὑπογύου κεκινῆσθαί τε καὶ λέγεσθαι τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἀπάγον καὶ παραλογίζεται. ἔτι τοίνυν (ἓν γάρ τι τῶν ὑψηλοτάτων τὸ Ἡροδότειον πεπίστευται) εἰ οὕτως ἔ . . .[1]

19. . . . <ἀσύμ>πλοκα[2] ἐκπίπτει καὶ οἱονεὶ προχεῖται τὰ λεγόμενα, ὀλίγου δεῖν φθάνοντα καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν λέγοντα. "καὶ συμβαλόντες," φησὶν ὁ Ξενοφῶν, "τὰς ἀσπίδας ἐωθοῦντο ἐμάχοντο ἀπέκτεινον ἀπέ-
2 θνῃσκον." καὶ τὰ τοῦ Εὐρυλόχου

ἤλθομεν, ὡς ἐκέλευες, ἀνὰ δρυμά, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ.
εἴδομεν ἐν βήσσῃσι τετυγμένα δώματα καλά.

τὰ γὰρ ἀλλήλων διακεκομμένα καὶ οὐδὲν ἧσσον κατεσπευσμένα φέρει τῆς ἀγωνίας ἔμφασιν ἅμα καὶ ἐμποδιζούσης τι καὶ συνδιωκούσης.[3] τοιαῦθ' ὁ ποιη-

[1] Perhaps ἔ<γραψε>, if Longinus was about to compare Herodotus' actual use of the figure with the ineffective alternative of doing without it. Cf. chap. 21.

[2] So K marg., Manutius.

[3] So Faber for P's συνδιοικούσης.

premeditated by the speaker but to be born of the moment; and this way of questioning and answering one's self counterfeits spontaneous emotion. People who are cross-questioned by others in the heat of the moment reply to the point forcibly and with utter candour; and in much the same way the figure of question and answer actually misleads the audience, by encouraging it to suppose that each carefully premeditated argument has been aroused in the mind and put into words on the spur of the moment. Moreover—for this passage of Herodotus has always been reckoned one of the most sublime—if in this way . . .[a]

[*Two pages are missing here.*]

19.[b] . . . the phrases tumble out unconnected in a sort of spate, almost too quick for the speaker himself. "And locking their shields," says Xenophon, "they pushed, fought, slew, fell."[c] And take the words of Eurylochus,

> We came, as you told us to come, through the oak-
> coppice, shining Odysseus.
> Built in the glades we beheld habitations of won-
> derful beauty.[d]

The phrases being disconnected, and yet none the less rapid, give the idea of an agitation which both checks the utterance and at the same time drives it on. This is the

[a] The passage of Herodotus cannot be identified, but may be 7.21, which has notable rhetorical questions.

[b] The subject is now asyndeton, i.e. the omission of conjunctions.

[c] Xenophon, *Hellenica* 4.3.19 (= *Agesilaus* 2.12).

[d] *Odyssey* 10.251–2.

τῆς ἐξήνεγκε διὰ τῶν ἀσυνδέτων.

20. Ἄκρως δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ ταὐτὸ σύνοδος τῶν σχημάτων εἴωθε κινεῖν, ὅταν δύο ἢ τρία οἷον κατὰ συμμορίαν ἀνακιρνάμενα ἀλλήλοις ἐρανίζῃ τὴν ἰσχὺν τὴν πειθὼ τὸ κάλλος, ὁποῖα καὶ τὰ εἰς τὸν Μειδίαν, ταῖς ἀναφοραῖς ὁμοῦ καὶ τῇ διατυπώσει συναναπεπλεγμένα τὰ ἀσύνδετα. "πολλὰ γὰρ ἂν ποιήσειεν ὁ τύπτων, ὧν ὁ παθὼν ἕνια οὐδ' ἂν ἀπαγγεῖλαι δύναιτο ἑτέρῳ, τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ." 2 εἶθ' ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὁ λόγος ἰὼν στῇ (ἐν στάσει γὰρ τὸ ἠρεμοῦν, ἐν ἀταξίᾳ δὲ τὸ πάθος, ἐπεὶ φορὰ ψυχῆς καὶ συγκίνησίς ἐστιν), εὐθὺς ἐπ' ἄλλα μεθήλατο ἀσύνδετα καὶ ἐπαναφοράς· "τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ, ὅταν ὡς ὑβρίζων, ὅταν ὡς ἐχθρός, ὅταν κονδύλοις, ὅταν ὡς δοῦλον." οὐδὲν ἄλλο διὰ τούτων ὁ ῥήτωρ ἢ ὅπερ ὁ τύπτων ἐργάζεται, τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν δικαστῶν τῇ ἐπαλλήλῳ πλήτ- 3 τει φορᾷ. εἶτ' ἐντεῦθεν πάλιν ὡς αἱ καταιγίδες ἄλλην ποιούμενος ἐμβολήν "ὅταν κονδύλοις, ὅταν ἐπὶ κόρρης" φησί· "ταῦτα κινεῖ, ταῦτα ἐξίστησιν ἀνθρώπους, ἀήθεις ὄντας τοῦ προπηλακίζεσθαι· οὐδεὶς ἂν ταῦτα ἀπαγγέλλων δύναιτο τὸ δεινὸν παραστῆσαι." οὐκοῦν τὴν μὲν φύσιν τῶν ἐπαναφορῶν καὶ ἀσυνδέτων πάντη φυλάττει τῇ συνεχεῖ μεταβολῇ· οὕτως αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ τάξις ἄτακτον καὶ ἔμπαλιν ἡ ἀταξία ποιὰν περιλαμβάνει τάξιν.

effect the poet has achieved by his use of asyndeton.

20. The combination of several figures often has an exceptionally powerful effect, when two or three combined cooperate, as it were, to contribute force, conviction, beauty. Thus, for instance, in the speech against Midias the asyndeta are interwoven with the figures of repetition and vivid presentation.[a] "For the aggressor may do many injuries, some of which the victim could not even describe to anyone else—by his manner, his look, his voice." Then to prevent the speech coming to a halt by running over the same ground—for immobility expresses inertia, while emotion, being a violent movement of the soul, demands disorder—he leaps at once into further asyndeta and anaphoras. "By his manner, his looks, his voice, when he strikes with insult, when he strikes like an enemy, when he strikes with his knuckles, when he strikes you like a slave." Here the orator does just the same as the aggressor, he belabours the minds of the jury with blow after blow. Then at this point he proceeds to make another onslaught, like a tornado. "When it's with his knuckles, when it's a slap on the face," he says, "this rouses, this maddens a man who is not accustomed to insult. Nobody could convey the horror of it simply by reporting it." Thus all the time he preserves the essence of his repetitions and asyndeta through continual variation, so that his very order is disordered and equally his disorder involves a certain element of order.

[a] Demosthenes, *Oration* 21.72 (with some variations from our text).

21. Φέρε οὖν, πρόσθες τοὺς συνδέσμους, εἰ θέλοις, ὡς ποιοῦσιν οἱ Ἰσοκράτειοι "καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ τοῦτο χρὴ παραλιπεῖν, ὡς πολλὰ ἂν ποιήσειεν ὁ τύπτων, πρῶτον μὲν τῷ σχήματι, εἶτα δὲ τῷ βλέμματι, εἶτά γε μὴν αὐτῇ τῇ φωνῇ," καὶ εἴσῃ κατὰ τὸ ἑξῆς οὕτως παραγράφων, ὡς τοῦ πάθους τὸ συνδεδιωγμένον καὶ ἀποτραχυνόμενον, ἐὰν τοῖς συνδέσμοις ἐξομαλίσῃς εἰς λειότητα, ἄκεντρόν τε
2 προσπίπτει καὶ εὐθὺς ἔσβεσται. ὥσπερ γὰρ εἴ τις συνδήσειε τῶν θεόντων τὰ σώματα τὴν φορὰν αὐτῶν ἀφῄρηται, οὕτως καὶ τὸ πάθος ὑπὸ τῶν συνδέσμων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προσθηκῶν ἐμποδιζόμενον ἀγανακτεῖ· τὴν γὰρ ἐλευθερίαν ἀπολλύει[1] τοῦ δρόμου καὶ τὸ ὡς ἀπ' ὀργάνου τινὸς ἀφίεσθαι.

22. Τῆς δὲ αὐτῆς ἰδέας καὶ τὰ ὑπερβατὰ θετέον. ἔστιν δὲ λέξεων ἢ νοήσεων ἐκ τοῦ κατ' ἀκολουθίαν κεκινημένη τάξις καὶ οἱονεὶ χαρακτὴρ ἐναγωνίου πάθους ἀληθέστατος. ὡς γὰρ οἱ τῷ ὄντι ὀργιζόμενοι ἢ φοβούμενοι ἢ ἀγανακτοῦντες ἢ ὑπὸ ζηλοτυπίας ἢ ὑπὸ ἄλλου τινός (πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἀναρίθμητα πάθη καὶ οὐδ' ἂν εἰπεῖν τις ὁπόσα δύναιτο) ἑκάστοτε παραπίπτοντες ἄλλα προθέμενοι πολλάκις ἐπ' ἄλλα μεταπηδῶσι, μέσα τινὰ παρεμβαλόντες ἀλόγως, εἶτ' αὖθις ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἀνακυκλοῦντες καὶ πάντη πρὸς τῆς ἀγωνίας, ὡς ὑπ' ἀστάτου πνεύματος, τῇδε κἀκεῖσε ἀγχιστρόφως ἀντισπώμενοι τὰς λέξεις τὰς

[1] So Finck for P's ἀπολύει.

21. Now insert the connecting particles, if you care to do so, in the style of Isocrates[a] and his school. "And yet one must not overlook this too, that the aggressor may do much, first by his manner, then by his looks, and then again by his mere voice." If you thus paraphrase it sentence by sentence you will see that if the rush and ruggedness of the emotion is levelled and smoothed out by the use of connecting particles,[b] it loses its sting and its fire is quickly put out. For just as you deprive runners of their speed if you bind them up, emotion equally resents being hampered by connecting particles and other appendages. It loses its freedom of motion and the sense of being, as it were, catapulted out.

22. In the same category we must place hyperbaton. This figure consists in arranging words and thoughts out of the natural sequence, and is, as it were, the truest mark of vehement emotion. Just as people who are really angry or frightened or indignant, or are carried away by jealousy or some other feeling—there are countless emotions, no one can say how many—often put forward one point and then spring off to another with various illogical interpolations, and then wheel round again to their original position, while, under the stress of their excitement, like a ship before a veering wind, they lay their words and

[a] Isocrates was the principal proponent and model of the periodic style which articulates every clause carefully and avoids hiatus.

[b] The word for "conjunction" or "connecting particle," *sundesmos*, literally means "bond."

νοήσεις τὴν ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἱρμοῦ παντοίως πρὸς μυρίας τροπὰς ἐναλλάττουσι τάξιν, οὕτω παρὰ τοῖς ἀρίστοις συγγραφεῦσι διὰ τῶν ὑπερβατῶν ἡ μίμησις ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἔργα φέρεται. τότε γὰρ ἡ τέχνη τέλειος, ἡνίκ' ἂν φύσις εἶναι δοκῇ, ἡ δ' αὖ φύσις ἐπιτυχής, ὅταν λανθάνουσαν περιέχῃ τὴν τέχνην. ὥσπερ λέγει ὁ Φωκαεὺς Διονύσιος παρὰ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ· "ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα, ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, εἶναι ἐλευθέροις ἢ δούλοις καὶ τούτοις ὡς δραπέτῃσιν. νῦν ὦν ὑμεῖς ἢν μὲν βούλησθε ταλαιπωρίας ἐνδέχεσθαι, παραχρῆμα μὲν πόνος ὑμῖν, οἷοί τε δὲ ἔσεσθε ὑπερβαλέσθαι
2 τοὺς πολεμίους." ἐνταῦθ' ἦν τὸ κατὰ τάξιν· "ὦ ἄνδρες Ἴωνες, νῦν καιρός ἐστιν ὑμῖν πόνους ἐπιδέχεσθαι· ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα." ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν "ἄνδρες Ἴωνες" ὑπερεβίβασεν· προεισέβαλεν οὖν[1] εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου, ὡς μηδ' ἀρχὴν φθάνων πρὸς τὸ ἐφεστὼς δέος προσαγορεῦσαι τοὺς ἀκούοντας· ἔπειτα δὲ τὴν τῶν νοημάτων ἀπέστρεψε τάξιν· πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ φῆσαι ὅτι αὐτοὺς δεῖ πονεῖν (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ὃ παρακελεύεται) ἔμπροσθεν ἀποδίδωσι τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν πονεῖν δεῖ, "ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς" φήσας "ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα," ὡς μὴ δοκεῖν ἐσκεμμένα λέγειν ἀλλ'
3 ἠναγκασμένα. ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης καὶ τὰ φύσει πάντως ἡνωμένα καὶ ἀδιανέμητα ὅμως ταῖς ὑπερβάσεσιν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἄγειν δεινότατος. ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης οὐχ οὕτως μὲν αὐθάδης ὥσπερ οὗτος,

thoughts first on one tack then another, and keep altering the natural order of sequence into innumerable variations—so, too, in the best prose writers the use of hyperbata allows imitation to approach the effects of nature. For art is only perfect when it looks like nature and Nature succeeds only when she conceals latent art. Take the speech of Dionysius the Phocaean, in Herodotus.[a] "Our fortunes stand upon a razor's edge, men of Ionia, whether we be free men or slaves, aye, and runaway slaves. Now, therefore if you are willing to endure hardship, at the moment there is toil for you, but you will be able to overcome your enemies." Here the natural order was, "O men of Ionia, now is the time for you to endure toil, for our fortunes stand upon a razor's edge." He has transposed "men of Ionia" and started at once with his fears, as though the terror was so immediate that he could not even address the audience first. He has, moreover, inverted the order of ideas. Before saying that they must toil—for that is the point of his exhortation—he first gives the reason why they must toil, by saying, "Our fortunes stand upon a razor's edge." The result is that his words do not seem premeditated but rather wrung from him. Thucydides is even more a master in the use of hyperbata to separate ideas which are naturally one and indivisible. Demosthenes, though not indeed so wilful as Thucydides,

[a] Herodotus 6.11.

---

[1] γὰρ Spengel.

πάντων δ' ἐν τῷ γένει τούτῳ κατακορέστατος καὶ πολὺ τὸ ἀγωνιστικὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὑπερβιβάζειν καὶ ἔτι νὴ Δία τὸ ἐξ ὑπογύου λέγειν συνεμφαίνων καὶ πρὸς τούτοις εἰς τὸν κίνδυνον τῶν μακρῶν ὑπερβατῶν
4 τοὺς ἀκούοντας συνεπισπώμενος· πολλάκις γὰρ τὸν νοῦν ὃν ὥρμησεν εἰπεῖν ἀνακρεμάσας καὶ μεταξύ πως[1] εἰς ἀλλόφυλον καὶ ἀπεοικυῖαν τάξιν ἄλλ' ἐπ' ἄλλοις διὰ μέσου καὶ ἔξωθέν ποθεν ἐπεισκυκλῶν εἰς φόβον ἐμβαλὼν τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὡς ἐπὶ παντελεῖ τοῦ λόγου διαπτώσει καὶ συναποκινδυνεύειν ὑπ' ἀγωνίας τῷ λέγοντι συναναγκάσας, εἶτα παραλόγως διὰ μακροῦ τὸ πάλαι ζητούμενον εὐκαίρως ἐπὶ τέλει που προσαποδούς, αὐτῷ τῷ κατὰ τὰς ὑπερβάσεις παραβόλῳ καὶ ἀκροσφαλεῖ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐκπλήττει. φειδὼ δὲ τῶν παραδειγμάτων ἔστω διὰ τὸ πλῆθος.

23. Τά γε μὴν πολύπτωτα λεγόμενα, ἀθροισμοὶ καὶ μεταβολαὶ καὶ κλίμακες, πάνυ ἀγωνιστικά, ὡς οἶσθα, κόσμου τε καὶ παντὸς ὕψους καὶ πάθους συνεργά. τί δὲ αἱ τῶν πτώσεων χρόνων προσώπων ἀριθμῶν γενῶν ἐναλλάξεις, πῶς ποτε καταποικίλ-
2 λουσι καὶ ἐπεγείρουσι τὰ ἑρμηνευτικά; φημὶ δὲ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς οὐ μόνα ταῦτα κοσμεῖν, ὁπόσα τοῖς τύποις ἑνικὰ ὄντα τῇ δυνάμει κατὰ τὴν ἀναθεώρησιν πληθυντικὰ εὑρίσκεται·

αὐτίκα (φησί) λαὸς ἀπείρων
θύννον[2] ἐπ' ἠιόνεσσι διιστάμενοι κελάδησαν·

[1] So Wilamowitz, for P's μεταξὺ ὡς.
[2] θύννον Vahlen for P's θύννων.

is the most lavish of all in this kind of use and not only employs hyperbata to give a great effect of vehemence, and indeed of improvisation, but also drags his audience along with him to share the perils of these long hyperbata. For he often suspends the sense which he has begun to express, and in the interval manages to bring forward one extraneous idea after another in a strange and unlikely order, making the audience terrified of a total collapse of the sentence, and compelling them from sheer excitement to share the speaker's risk: then unexpectedly, after a great interval, the long-lost phrase turns up pat at the end, so that he astounds them all the more by the very recklessness and audacity of the transpositions. But there are so many examples that I must stay my hand.

23. Again, accumulation, variation, and climax, the so-called "polyptota," are, as you know, very powerful, and contribute to ornament and to sublimity and emotion of all kinds. And consider, too, what variety and liveliness is lent to the exposition by changes of case, tense, person, number, or gender. In the category of number, for example, not only are those uses ornamental where the singular in form is found on consideration to signify a plural—take the lines:

> And straightway a numberless people
> Scatter the length of the beaches and thunder, "the
> Tunny, the Tunny!"[a]

[a] The source of this quotation is not known. If the text here printed is right, the reference is to tunny-fishing, when the approach of a shoal is watched for and eagerly announced to the fishermen.

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνα μᾶλλον παρατηρήσεως ἄξια, ὅτι ἔσθ' ὅπου προσπίπτει τὰ πληθυντικὰ μεγαλορρημονέστερα καὶ αὐτῷ δοξοκοποῦντα τῷ ὄχλῳ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ.

3 τοιαῦτα παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ Οἰδίπου·

ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι,
ἐφύσαθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ φυτεύσαντες πάλιν
ἀνεῖτε ταὐτὸ σπέρμα κἀπεδείξατε
πατέρας ἀδελφοὺς παῖδας, αἷμ' ἐμφύλιον,
νύμφας γυναῖκας μητέρας τε χὠπόσα
αἴσχιστ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔργα γίγνεται.

πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἓν ὄνομά ἐστιν, Οἰδίπους, ἐπὶ δὲ θατέρου Ἰοκάστη, ἀλλ' ὅμως χυθεὶς εἰς τὰ πληθυντικὰ ὁ ἀριθμὸς συνεπλήθυσε καὶ τὰς ἀτυχίας· καὶ ὡς ἐκεῖνα πεπλεόνασται,

ἐξῆλθον Ἕκτορές τε καὶ Σαρπηδόνες·

4 καὶ τὸ Πλατωνικόν, ὃ καὶ ἑτέρωθι παρετεθείμεθα, ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων· "οὐ γὰρ Πέλοπες οὐδὲ Κάδμοι οὐδ' Αἴγυπτοί τε καὶ Δαναοὶ οὐδ' ἄλλοι πολλοὶ φύσει βάρβαροι συνοικοῦσιν ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ Ἕλληνες, οὐ μιξοβάρβαροι οἰκοῦμεν" καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. φύσει γὰρ ἐξακούεται τὰ πράγματα κομπωδέστερα ἀγεληδὸν οὕτως τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπισυντιθεμένων. οὐ μέντοι δεῖ ποιεῖν αὐτὸ ἐπ' ἄλλων εἰ μὴ ἐφ' ὧν δέχεται τὰ ὑποκείμενα[1] αὔξησιν ἢ πληθὺν ἢ ὑπερβολὴν ἢ πάθος,

[1] ὑποκείμενα Petra for ὑπερκείμενα.

—but it is still more worthy of notice that plurals sometimes make a grander impression, courting favour by the sense of multitude given by the grammatical number. This is the case with Sophocles' lines about Oedipus:

> Curse on the marriages
> That gave us birth and having given birth
> Flung forth the selfsame seed again and showed
> Fathers and sons and brothers all blood-kin,
> And brides and wives and mothers, all the shame
> Of all the foulest deeds that men have done.[a]

These all mean one person, Oedipus, and on the other side Jocasta, but the expansion into the plural serves to make the misfortunes plural as well. There is the same sense of multiplication in "Forth came Hectors and Sarpedons too,"[b] and in the passage of Plato about the Athenians, which we have also quoted elsewhere: "For no Pelopses nor Cadmuses nor Aegyptuses and Danauses nor any other hordes of born barbarians share our home, but we are pure Greeks here, no semi-barbarians,"[c] and so on. The facts naturally sound more imposing from the accumulation of names in groups. This device should not, however, be employed except where the subject invites

[a] *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1403–8.

[b] Source unknown: see Kannicht-Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* II (Adespota 1 fr. 289).

[c] Plato, *Menexenus* 245D. "Elsewhere" presumably refers to another book.

ἔν τι τούτων ἢ τὰ πλείονα, ἐπεί τοι τὸ πανταχοῦ κώδωνας ἐξῆφθαι λίαν σοφιστικόν.

24. Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τοὐναντίον τὰ ἐκ τῶν πληθυντικῶν εἰς τὰ ἑνικὰ ἐπισυναγόμενα ἐνίοτε ὑψηλοφανέστατα. "ἔπειθ' ἡ Πελοπόννησος ἅπασα διειστήκει" φησί. "καὶ δὴ Φρυνίχῳ δρᾶμα Μιλήτου ἅλωσιν διδάξαντι εἰς δάκρυα ἔπεσε το θέητρον."[1] τὸ ἐκ τῶν διῃρημένων εἰς τὰ ἡνωμένα ἐπισυστρέψαι τὸν ἀριθ-
2 μὸν σωματοειδέστερον. αἴτιον δ' ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν τοῦ κόσμου ταὐτὸν οἶμαι· ὅπου τε γὰρ ἑνικὰ ὑπάρχει τὰ ὀνόματα, τὸ πολλὰ ποιεῖν αὐτὰ παρὰ δόξαν ἐμπαθοῦς, ὅπου τε πληθυντικά, τὸ εἰς ἕν τι εὔηχον συγκορυφοῦν τὰ πλείονα διὰ τὴν εἰς τοὐναντίον μεταμόρφωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν τῷ παραλόγῳ.

25. Ὅταν γε μὴν τὰ παρεληλυθότα τοῖς χρόνοις εἰσάγῃς ὡς γινόμενα καὶ παρόντα, οὐ διήγησιν ἔτι τὸν λόγον ἀλλ' ἐναγώνιον πρᾶγμα ποιήσεις. "πεπτωκὼς δέ τις," φησὶν ὁ Ξενοφῶν, "ὑπὸ τῷ Κύρου ἵππῳ καὶ πατούμενος παίει τῇ μαχαίρᾳ εἰς τὴν γαστέρα τὸν ἵππον· ὁ δὲ σφαδάζων ἀποσείεται τὸν Κῦρον, ὁ δὲ πίπτει." τοιοῦτος ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ὁ Θουκυδίδης.

26. Ἐναγώνιος δ' ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ τῶν προσώπων ἀντιμετάθεσις καὶ πολλάκις ἐν μέσοις τοῖς κινδύνοις ποιοῦσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν δοκεῖν στρέφεσθαι.

[1] ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον Toll for ἔπεσον οἱ θεώμενοι.

amplification or redundance or exaggeration or emotion, either one or more of these. To have bells hung all over you is the mark of a sophist.

24. Yet again, the converse of this, the contraction of plurals to singulars, sometimes gives a great effect of sublimity. "Moreover, the whole Peloponnese was split," says Demosthenes.[a] Again, "when Phrynichus produced his *Capture of Miletus* the theatre burst into tears."[b] To compress the number of separate individuals into a unified whole gives more sense of solidity. The ornamental effect in both is due to the same cause. Where the words are singular, to make them unexpectedly plural suggests emotion: where they are plural and you combine a number of things into a well-sounding singular, then this opposite change of the facts gives an effect of surprise.

25. Again, if you introduce events in past time as happening at the present moment, the passage will be transformed from a narrative into a vivid actuality. "Someone has fallen," says Xenophon, "under Cyrus' horse and, as he is trodden under foot, is striking the horse's belly with his dagger. The horse, rearing, throws Cyrus, and he falls."[c] Thucydides uses such effects very often.

26. Change of person gives an equally powerful effect, and often makes the audience feel themselves set in the thick of the danger.

[a] *De corona* (*Oration* 18) 18.
[b] Herodotus 6.21.
[c] Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.1.37.

φαίης κ' ἀκμῆτας καὶ ἀτειρέας
ἄντεσθ' ἐν πολέμῳ· ὣς ἐσσυμένως ἐμάχοντο.

καὶ ὁ Ἄρατος

μὴ κείνῳ ἐνὶ μηνὶ περικλύζοιο θαλάσσῃ.

2 ὧδέ που καὶ ὁ Ἡρόδοτος· "ἀπὸ δὲ Ἐλεφαντίνης πόλεως ἄνω πλεύσεαι, καὶ ἔπειτα ἀφίξῃ ἐς πεδίον λεῖον· διεξελθὼν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον αὖθις εἰς ἕτερον πλοῖον ἐμβὰς πλεύσεαι δύ' ἡμέρας, ἔπειτα ἥξεις ἐς πόλιν μεγάλην, ᾗ ὄνομα Μερόη." ὁρᾷς, ὦ ἑταῖρε, ὡς παραλαβών σου τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ τῶν τόπων ἄγει τὴν ἀκοὴν ὄψιν ποιῶν; πάντα δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸς αὐτὰ ἀπερειδόμενα τὰ πρόσωπα ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἵστησι τὸν
3 ἀκροατὴν τῶν ἐνεργουμένων. καὶ ὅταν ὡς οὐ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀλλ' ὡς πρὸς μόνον τινὰ λαλῇς,

Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη,

ἐμπαθέστερόν τε αὐτὸν ἅμα καὶ προσεκτικώτερον καὶ ἀγῶνος ἔμπλεων ἀποτελέσεις, ταῖς εἰς ἑαυτὸν προσφωνήσεσιν ἐξεγειρόμενον.

27. Ἔτι γε μὴν ἔσθ' ὅτε περὶ προσώπου διηγούμενος ὁ συγγραφεὺς ἐξαίφνης παρενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ αὐτοπρόσωπον ἀντιμεθίσταται, καὶ ἔστι τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶδος ἐκβολή τις πάθους.

---

[a] *Iliad* 15.697–8.
[b] Aratus, *Phaenomena* 287.

> . . . You would say that unworn and
> with temper undaunted
> Each met the other in war, so headlong the rush of
> their battle.[a]

And Aratus' line:

> In that month may you never be found where the
> sea surges round you.[b]

Herodotus does much the same: "You will sail up from the city of Elephantine and there come to a smooth plain. And when you have passed through that place you will board again another ship and sail two days and then you will come to a great city, the name of which is Meroe."[c] Do you see, friend, how he takes you along with him through the country and turns hearing into sight? All such passages with a direct personal address put the hearer in the presence of the action itself. By appearing to address not the whole audience but a single individual—

> Of Tydeus' son you could not have known with
> which of the hosts he was fighting—[d]

you will move him more and make him more attentive and full of active interest, because he is roused by the appeals to him in person.

27. Again sometimes a writer, while speaking about a person suddenly turns and changes into the person himself. A figure of this kind is a sort of outbreak of emotion:

[c] Herodotus 2.29.
[d] *Iliad* 5.85.

> Ἕκτωρ δὲ Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν ἀΰσας
> νηυσὶν ἐπισσεύεσθαι, ἐᾶν δ' ἔναρα βροτόεντα·
> ὃν δ' ἂν ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε νεῶν ἐθέλοντα νοήσω,
> αὐτοῦ οἱ θάνατον μητίσομαι.

οὐκοῦν τὴν μὲν διήγησιν ἅτε πρέπουσαν ὁ ποιητὴς προσῆψεν ἑαυτῷ, τὴν δ' ἀπότομον ἀπειλὴν τῷ θυμῷ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος ἐξαπίνης οὐδὲν προδηλώσας περιέθηκεν· ἐψύχετο γάρ, εἰ παρενετίθει "ἔλεγεν δὲ τοιά τινα καὶ τοῖα ὁ Ἕκτωρ," νυνὶ δ' ἔφθακεν ἄφνω τὸν μετα-
2 βαίνοντα ἡ τοῦ λόγου μετάβασις. διὸ καὶ ἡ πρόσχρησις[1] τοῦ σχήματος τότε, ἡνίκ' ἂν ὀξὺς ὁ καιρὸς ὢν διαμέλλειν τῷ γράφοντι μὴ διδῷ ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐπαναγκάζῃ μεταβαίνειν ἐκ προσώπων εἰς πρόσωπα· ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἑκαταίῳ· "Κῆυξ δὲ ταῦτα δεινὰ ποιούμενος αὐτίκα ἐκέλευε τοὺς [Ἡρακλείδας][2] ἐπιγόνους ἐκχωρεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖν δυνατός εἰμι ἀρήγειν. ὡς μὴ ὢν αὐτοί τε ἀπολέεσθε κἀμὲ
3 τρώσετε, ἐς ἄλλον τινὰ δῆμον ἀποίχεσθε." ὁ μὲν γὰρ Δημοσθένης κατ' ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀριστογείτονος ἐμπαθὲς τὸ πολυπρόσωπον καὶ ἀγχίστροφον παρέστακεν. "καὶ οὐδεὶς ὑμῶν χολήν," φησίν, "οὐδ' ὀργὴν ἔχων εὑρεθήσεται ἐφ' οἷς ὁ βδελυρὸς οὗτος καὶ ἀναιδὴς βιάζεται, ὅς, ὦ μιαρώτατε ἁπάντων, κεκλεισμένης σοι τῆς παρρησίας οὐ κιγκλίσιν οὐδὲ θύραις, ἃ καὶ παρανοίξειεν ἄν τις ..." ἐν ἀτελεῖ τῷ νῷ ταχὺ διαλλάξας καὶ μόνον

[1] πρόσχρησις Manutius for πρόχρησις P.
[2] [Ἡρακλείδας] del. Russell (1964).

Hector lifted his voice and cried afar to the Trojans
To rush back now to the galleys and leave the
blood-spattered booty.
Whomsoever I see of his own will afar from the
galleys,
Death for him there will I plan.[a]

There the poet has assigned the narrative to himself as his proper share, and then suddenly without any warning attached the abrupt threat to the angry champion. To insert "Hector said so and so" would have been frigid. As it is, the change of construction has suddenly run ahead of the change of speaker. So this figure is useful, when a sudden crisis will not let the writer wait, and forces him to change at once from one character to another. There is an instance in Hecataeus: "Ceyx took this ill and immediately bade the descendants be gone. For I cannot help you. So to prevent perishing yourselves and hurting me, away with you to some other people."[b] By a somewhat different method Demosthenes in the *Aristogeiton* has used variety of person to suggest rapid shifts of emotion. "And will none of you," he says, "be found to feel anger and indignation at the violence of this shameless rascal, who—oh you most accursed of villains, who are cut off from free speech not by gates and doors which one might very well open . . ."[c] Leaving his sense incomplete he has

[a] *Iliad* 15.346–9.

[b] Hecataeus fr. 30 (*FGrHist* 1). By descendants, Hecataeus means the descendants of Heracles, as the intrusive gloss indicates: Ceyx, king of Trachis, is unable to help them, and so sends them away. See Diodorus Siculus 4.57.2.

[c] [Demosthenes] *Or.* 25.27–8.

οὐ μίαν λέξιν διὰ τὸν θυμὸν εἰς δύο διασπάσας πρόσωπα "ὅς, ὦ μιαρώτατε" εἶτα πρὸς τὸν Ἀριστογείτονα τὸν λόγον[1] ἀποστρέψας καὶ ἀπολιπεῖν δοκῶν, ὅμως διὰ τοῦ πάθους πολὺ πλέον ἐπέστρεψεν.
4 οὐκ ἄλλως ἡ Πηνελόπη·

κῆρυξ, τίπτε δέ σε πρόεσαν μνηστῆρες
ἀγαυοί;
εἰπέμεναι δμωῇσιν Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
ἔργων παύσασθαι, σφίσι δ' αὐτοῖς δαῖτα
πένεσθαι;
μὴ μνηστεύσαντες, μηδ' ἄλλοθ' ὁμιλήσαντες,
ὕστατα καὶ πύματα νῦν ἐνθάδε δειπνήσειαν,
οἳ θάμ' ἀγειρόμενοι βίοτον κατακείρετε πολλόν,
. . . οὐδέ τι πατρῶν
ὑμετέρων τῶν πρόσθεν ἀκούετε, παῖδες ἐόντες,
οἷος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκε.

28. Καὶ μέντοι περίφρασις ὡς οὐχ ὑψηλοποιόν, οὐδεὶς ἂν οἶμαι διστάσειεν. ὡς γὰρ ἐν μουσικῇ διὰ τῶν παραφώνων καλουμένων ὁ κύριος φθόγγος ἡδίων ἀποτελεῖται, οὕτως ἡ περίφρασις πολλάκις συμφθέγγεται τῇ κυριολογίᾳ καὶ εἰς κόσμον ἐπὶ πολὺ συνηχεῖ, καὶ μάλιστ', ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ φυσῶδές τι
2 καὶ ἄμουσον ἀλλ' ἡδέως κεκραμένον. ἱκανὸς δὲ τοῦτο τεκμηριῶσαι καὶ Πλάτων κατὰ τὴν εἰσβολὴν

[1] So Weiske, for τὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀριστογείτονα λόγον. Editors have also proposed a lacuna before ἀπολιπεῖν, supplying,

made a sudden change and in his indignation almost a split a single phrase between two persons—"who—oh you most accursed"— and thus, while swinging his speech round on to Aristogeiton and appearing to abandon the jury, he has yet by means of the emotion made his appeal to them much more intense. Penelope does the same:

> Herald, oh why have they sent you hither, those high-born suitors?
> Is it to tell the hand-maidens that serve in the house of Odysseus
> Now to desist from their tasks and make ready a feast for the suitors?
> Would that they never had wooed me nor ever met here in our halls,
> Would they might make in my house their last and latest of banquets,
> You that meet often together and utterly ravage our substance!
> . . . Nor yet from your fathers
> Heard you ever at home long ago in the days of your childhood
> What manner of man was Odysseus.[a]

28. That periphrasis can contribute to the sublime, no one, I fancy, would question. Just as in music what we call accompaniment enhances the beauty of the melody, so periphrasis often chimes in with the literal expression and gives it a far richer note, especially if it is not bombastic or tasteless but agreeably blended. A sufficient proof of this

[a] *Odyssey* 4.681–9.

---

e.g., <τοὺς κριτὰς>. The translation assumes this sense. See Bühler (1964), 130.

τοῦ ἐπιταφίου· "ἔργῳ μὲν ὑμῖν οἷδ' ἔχουσι τὰ προσήκοντα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς, ὧν τυχόντες πορεύονται τὴν εἱμαρμένην πορείαν, προπεμφθέντες κοινῇ μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἕκαστος ὑπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων." οὐκοῦν τὸν θάνατον εἶπεν εἱμαρμένην πορείαν, τὸ δὲ τετυχηκέναι τῶν νομιζομένων προπομπήν τινα δημοσίαν ὑπὸ τῆς πατρίδος. ἆρα δὴ τούτοις μετρίως ὤγκωσε τὴν νόησιν, ἢ ψιλὴν λαβὼν τὴν λέξιν ἐμελοποίησε καθάπερ ἁρμονίαν τινὰ τὴν
3 ἐκ τῆς περιφράσεως περιχεάμενος εὐμέλειαν; καὶ Ξενοφῶν "πόνον δὲ τοῦ ζῆν ἡδέως ἡγεμόνα νομίζετε, κάλλιστον δὲ πάντων καὶ πολεμικώτατον κτῆμα εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς συγκεκόμισθε· ἐπαινούμενοι γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι χαίρετε" ἀντὶ τοῦ "πονεῖν θέλετε" "πόνον ἡγεμόνα τοῦ ζῆν ἡδέως ποιεῖσθε" εἰπὼν καὶ τἆλλ' ὁμοίως ἐπεκτείνας μεγάλην τινὰ
4 ἔννοιαν τῷ ἐπαίνῳ προσπεριωρίσατο. καὶ τὸ ἀμίμητον ἐκεῖνο τοῦ Ἡροδότου· "τῶν δὲ Σκυθέων τοῖς συλήσασιν τὸ ἱερὸν ἐνέβαλεν ἡ θεὸς θήλειαν νοῦσον."

29. Ἐπίκηρον μέντοι τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἡ περίφρασις, τῶν ἄλλων πλέον, εἰ μὴ σὺν μέτρῳ[1] τινὶ λαμβάνοιτο· εὐθὺς γὰρ ἀβλεμὲς προσπίπτει, κουφολογίας τε ὄζον καὶ παχύτητος.[2] ὅθεν καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα (δεινὸς γὰρ ἀεὶ περὶ σχῆμα κἄν τισιν ἀκαίρως) ἐν τοῖς

[1] σὺν μέτρῳ Morus for συμμέτρως.
[2] παχύτητος Manutius, for παχύτατον.

is the opening of Plato's Funeral Oration: "First then in deeds we have given them their due reward, and, this won, they travel now their destined journey, escorted all in common by their country and each man severally by his kinsmen."[a] Here he calls death a destined journey and their enjoyment of due rites a sort of public escort by their country. Is it a trivial dignity that he thus gives to the thought, or has he rather taken the literal expression and made it musical, wrapping it, as it were, in the tuneful harmonies of his periphrasis? Again Xenophon says, "You hold that hard work is a guide to the pleasures of life and you have stored in your hearts the noblest and most warrior-like of all treasures. For nothing pleases you so much as praise."[b] By saying "You make hard work a guide to living with pleasure" instead of "You are willing to work hard," and by similarly expanding the rest of his sentence, he has invested the eulogy with a further grand idea. Then there is that inimitable phrase in Herodotus: "Upon those Scythians that sacked her temple the goddess sent a female malady."[c]

29. However it is a risky business, periphrasis, more so than any of the other figures, unless used with a due sense of proportion. For it soon falls flat, smacking of triviality and grossness. So that critics have even made fun of Plato—always so clever at a figure, sometimes

[a] Plato, *Menexenus* 236D.
[b] Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.5.12.
[c] Herodotus 1.105.4.

Νόμοις λέγοντα "ὡς οὔτε ἀργυροῦν δεῖ πλοῦτον οὔτε χρυσοῦν ἐν πόλει ἱδρυμένον ἐᾶν οἰκεῖν" διαχλευάζουσιν, ὡς εἰ πρόβατα, φησίν, ἐκώλυε κεκτῆσθαι, δῆλον ὅτι προβάτειον ἂν καὶ βόειον πλοῦτον ἔλεγεν.

2 Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἅλις ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὰ ὑψηλὰ τῶν σχημάτων χρήσεως ἐκ παρενθήκης τοσαῦτα πεφιλολογῆσθαι, Τερεντιανὲ φίλτατε· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα παθητικωτέρους καὶ συγκεκινημένους ἀποτελεῖ τοὺς λόγους· πάθος δὲ ὕψους μετέχει τοσοῦτον, ὁπόσον ἦθος ἡδονῆς.

30. Ἐπειδὴ μέντοι ἡ τοῦ λόγου νόησις ἥ τε φράσις τὰ πλείω δι' ἑκατέρου διέπτυκται, ἴθι δή, [ἂν][1] τοῦ φραστικοῦ μέρους εἴ[2] τινα λοιπὰ ἔτι, προσεπιθεασώμεθα. ὅτι μὲν τοίνυν ἡ τῶν κυρίων καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογὴ θαυμαστῶς ἄγει καὶ κατακηλεῖ τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ ὡς πᾶσι τοῖς ῥήτορσι καὶ συγγραφεῦσι κατ' ἄκρον ἐπιτήδευμα, μέγεθος ἅμα κάλλος εὐπίνειαν βάρος ἰσχὺν κράτος ἔτι δὲ γάνωσίν τινα τοῖς λόγοις ὥσπερ ἀγάλμασι καλλίστοις δι' αὐτῆς ἐπανθεῖν παρασκευάζουσα καὶ οἱονεὶ ψυχήν τινα τοῖς πράγμασι φωνητικὴν ἐντιθεῖσα, μὴ καὶ περιττὸν ᾖ πρὸς εἰδότας διεξιέναι. φῶς γὰρ τῷ

2 ὄντι ἴδιον τοῦ νοῦ τὰ καλὰ ὀνόματα. ὁ μέντοι γε ὄγκος αὐτῶν οὐ πάντη χρειώδης, ἐπεὶ τοῖς μικροῖς πραγματίοις περιτιθέναι μεγάλα καὶ σεμνὰ ὀνόματα ταὐτὸν ἂν φαίνοιτο, ὡς εἴ τις τραγικὸν προσωπεῖον

[1] [ἂν] del. Russell (1964).

unseasonably so—for saying in his *Laws* "that we should not let silvern treasure nor golden settle and make a home in a city."[a] Had he been forbidding people to possess sheep, says the critic, he would clearly have said "ovine and bovine treasure."

But, my dear Terentianus, this digression must suffice for our discussion of the use of figures as factors in the sublime. They all serve to lend emotion and excitement to the style. But emotion is as much an element of the sublime, as characterization is of charm.[b]

30. Now, since thought and diction are generally closely involved with each other we must further consider whether there are any elements of diction still left untouched. It is probably superfluous to explain at length to someone who knows, how the choice of the right word and the fine word has a marvellously moving and seductive effect upon an audience and how all orators and prose writers make this their supreme object. For this of itself gives to the style at once grandeur, beauty, old-world charm, weight, force, strength, and a sort of lustre, like the bloom on the surface of the most beautiful bronzes, and endows the facts as it were with a living voice. Truly, beautiful words are the very light of thought. However, their majesty is not for common use, since to attach great and stately words to trivial things would be

[a] Plato, *Laws* 7.801B

[b] Cf. the comparison between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, above 9.11–15.

---

[2] Spengel reads ἢ, retaining ἄν.

μέγα παιδὶ περιθείη νηπίῳ. πλὴν ἐν μὲν ποιήσει καὶ ἱ . . .[1]

31. . . . θρεπτικώτατον καὶ γόνιμον, τὸ δ'[2] Ἀνακρέοντος "οὐκέτι Θρηικίης <πώλου>[3] ἐπιστρέφομαι." ταύτῃ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοπόμπου καινὸν ἐπαινετόν[4]—διὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον ἔμοι γε σημαντικώτατα ἔχειν δοκεῖ—ὅπερ ὁ Καικίλιος οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως καταμέμφεται. "δεινὸς ὤν," φησίν, "ὁ Φίλιππος ἀναγκοφαγῆσαι πράγματα." ἔστιν ἄρ' ὁ ἰδιωτισμὸς ἐνίοτε τοῦ κόσμου παρὰ πολὺ ἐμφανιστικώτερον· ἐπιγινώσκεται γὰρ αὐτόθεν ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ βίου, τὸ δὲ σύνηθες ἤδη πιστότερον. οὐκοῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ τὰ αἰσχρὰ καὶ ῥυπαρὰ τλημόνως καὶ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα
2 πλεονεξίας καρτεροῦντος τὸ ἀναγκοφαγεῖν τὰ πράγματα ἐναργέστατα παρείληπται. ὧδέ πως ἔχει καὶ τὰ Ἡροδότεια· "ὁ Κλεομένης," φησί, "μανεὶς τὰς ἑαυτοῦ σάρκας ξιφιδίῳ κατέτεμεν εἰς λεπτά, ἕως ὅλον καταχορδεύων ἑαυτὸν διέφθειρεν," καί "ὁ Πύθης ἕως τοῦδε ἐπὶ τῆς νεὼς ἐμάχετο, ἕως ἅπας κατεκρεουργήθη." ταῦτα γὰρ ἐγγὺς παραξύει τὸν ἰδιώτην, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἰδιωτεύει τῷ σημαντικῶς.

[1] ἱστορίᾳ (Toll) must be the word that is broken off.

[2] Perhaps τὸ τἀνακρέοντος (Russell 1964); but it is possible that οὐκέτι is not part of the quotation, and that the writer means that Anacreon's phrase (by contrast with something just mentioned, and lost to us) is *not* admirable.

[3] <πώλου> supplied by Bergk.

[4] So Vahlen; καὶ τὸν ἐπήνετον P.

like fastening a great tragic mask on a little child. However in poetry and history . . .

[*Four pages are lost here.*]

31. . . . is most nourishing and productive; so, too, with Anacreon's "No more care I for the Thracian filly."[a] In the same way the novel phrase used by Theopompus is commendable; it seems to me extremely expressive because of the analogy, though Caecilius for some reason finds fault with it. "Philip," he says, "had a wonderful faculty of stomaching things."[b] Thus a common expression sometimes proves far more vivid than elegant language. Being taken from our common life it is immediately recognized, and what is familiar is thereby the more convincing. Applied to one whose greedy ambition makes him glad to endure with patience what is shameful and sordid, "stomaching things" forms a very vivid phrase. It is much the same with Herodotus' phrases: "In his madness," he says, "Cleomenes cut his own flesh into strips with a dagger, until he made mincemeat of himself and perished," and "Pythes went on fighting in the ship until he was chopped to pieces."[c] These come perilously near to vulgarity, but are not vulgar because they are so expressive.

[a] Anacreon, fr. eleg. 5 (D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* II p. 148).

[b] Theopompus fr. 262 (*FGrHist* 115 F 262).

[c] Herodotus 6.75, 7.181.

32. Περὶ δὲ πλήθους [καὶ][1] μεταφορῶν ὁ μὲν Καικίλιος ἔοικε συγκατατίθεσθαι τοῖς δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς ἐπὶ ταὐτοῦ νομοθετοῦσι τάττεσθαι· ὁ γὰρ Δημοσθένης ὅρος καὶ τῶν τοιούτων· ὁ τῆς χρείας δὲ καιρός, ἔνθα τὰ πάθη χειμάρρου δίκην ἐλαύνεται, καὶ τὴν πολυπλήθειαν αὐτῶν ὡς ἀναγ-
2 καίαν ἐνταῦθα συνεφέλκεται. "ἄνθρωποι," φησί "μιαροὶ καὶ κόλακες, ἠκρωτηριασμένοι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι πατρίδας, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν προπεπωκότες πρότερον Φιλίππῳ, νυνὶ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, τῇ γαστρὶ μετροῦντες καὶ τοῖς αἰσχίστοις τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, τὴν δ' ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὸ μηδένα ἔχειν δεσπότην, ἃ τοῖς πρότερον Ἕλλησιν ὅροι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἦσαν καὶ κανόνες, ἀνατετροφότες." ἐνταῦθα τῷ πλήθει τῶν τροπικῶν ὁ κατὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ἐπιπροσθεῖ τοῦ ῥήτο-
3 ρος θυμός. διόπερ ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ ὁ Θεόφραστος μειλίγματά φασί τινα τῶν θρασειῶν εἶναι ταῦτα μεταφορῶν, τὸ "ὡσπερεί" φάναι καί "οἱονεί" καί "εἰ χρὴ τοῦτον εἰπεῖν τὸν τρόπον" καί "εἰ δεῖ παρακινδυνευτικώτερον λέξαι." ἡ γὰρ ὑποτίμησις,
4 φασίν, ἰᾶται τὰ τολμηρά· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἀποδέχομαι, ὅμως δὲ πλήθους καὶ τόλμης μεταφορῶν, ὅπερ ἔφην κἀπὶ[2] τῶν σχημάτων, τὰ εὔκαιρα καὶ σφοδρὰ πάθη καὶ τὸ γενναῖον ὕψος εἶναί φημι ἴδιά τινα ἀλεξιφάρμακα, ὅτι τῷ ῥοθίῳ τῆς φορᾶς ταυτὶ

[1] καὶ deleted by Robortelli.
[2] κἀπὶ Pearce for κἄπειτα.

32. As to the proper number of metaphors, Caecilius seems on the side of those who rule that not more than two or at the most three may be used together. Demosthenes assuredly is the canon in these matters too. And the occasion for their use is when emotion sweeps on like a flood and carries the multitude of metaphors along as an inevitable consequence. "Men," he says, "of evil life, flatterers, who have each foully mutilated their own country and toasted away their liberty first to Philip and now to Alexander, men who measure happiness by their bellies and their basest appetites, and have overthrown that liberty and freedom from despotism which to Greeks of older days was the canon and standard of all that was good."[a] Here it is the orator's indignation against the traitors which screens the multitude of metaphors. Accordingly, Aristotle and Theophrastus say that bold metaphors are softened by inserting "as if" or "as it were" or "if one may say so" or "if one may risk the expression."[b] The apology, they tell us, mitigates the audacity of the language. I accept this, but at the same time, as I said in speaking of figures, the proper antidote for a multitude of daring metaphors is strong and timely emotion and genuine sublimity. These by their nature sweep everything

[a] *De corona* (= *Or.* 18) 296.

[b] See Aristotle fr. 131 Rose, with *Rhet.* 3.7.1408b2, Cicero, *De oratore* 3.165, Theophrastus fr. 690 Fortenbaugh.

πέφυκεν ἅπαντα τἆλλα παρασύρειν καὶ προωθεῖν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ὡς ἀναγκαῖα πάντως εἰσπράττεσθαι τὰ παράβολα, καὶ οὐκ ἐᾷ τὸν ἀκροατὴν σχολάζειν περὶ τὸν τοῦ πλήθους ἔλεγχον διὰ τὸ συνενθουσιᾶν τῷ λέγοντι.

5 Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἔν γε ταῖς τοπηγορίαις καὶ διαγραφαῖς οὐκ ἄλλο τι οὕτως κατασημαντικὸν ὡς οἱ συνεχεῖς καὶ ἐπάλληλοι τρόποι. δι' ὧν καὶ παρὰ Ξενοφῶντι ἡ τἀνθρωπίνου σκήνους ἀνατομὴ πομπικῶς καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἀναζωγραφεῖται θείως παρὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι. τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ φησιν ἀκρόπολιν, ἰσθμὸν δὲ μέσον διῳκοδομῆσθαι μεταξὺ τοῦ στήθους τὸν αὐχένα, σφονδύλους τε ὑπεστηρῖχθαί φησιν οἷον στρόφιγγας καὶ τὴν μὲν ἡδονὴν ἀνθρώποις εἶναι κακῶν[1] δέλεαρ, γλῶσσαν δὲ γεύσεως δοκίμιον· ἄναμμα δὲ τῶν φλεβῶν τὴν καρδίαν καὶ πηγὴν τοῦ περιφερομένου σφοδρῶς αἵματος, εἰς τὴν δορυφορικὴν οἴκησιν κατατεταγμένην· τὰς δὲ διαδρομὰς τῶν πόρων ὀνομάζει στενωπούς· "τῇ δὲ πηδήσει τῆς καρδίας ἐν τῇ τῶν δεινῶν προσδοκίᾳ καὶ τῇ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐπεγέρσει, ἐπειδὴ διάπυρος ἦν, ἐπικουρίαν μηχανώμενοι," φησί, "τὴν τοῦ πλεύμονος ἰδέαν ἐνεφύτευσαν, μαλακὴν καὶ ἄναιμον καὶ σήραγγας ἐντὸς ἔχουσαν ὁποῖον μάλαγμα, ἵν' ὁ θυμὸς ὁπότ' ἐν αὐτῇ ζέσῃ, πηδῶσα εἰς ὑπεῖκον μὴ λυμαίνηται." καὶ τὴν μὲν τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν οἴκησιν προσεῖπεν ὡς γυναικωνῖτιν, τὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ δὲ ὥσπερ ἀνδρωνῖτιν· τόν γε μὴν σπλῆνα τῶν ἐντὸς μαγεῖον,

along in the forward surge of their current, or rather they positively demand bold imagery as essential to their effect, and do not give the hearer time to examine how many metaphors there are, because he shares the excitement of the speaker.

Moreover in the treatment of a commonplace and in descriptions there is nothing so expressive as a sustained series of metaphors. It is thus that in Xenophon[a] the anatomy of the human tabernacle is magnificently depicted, and still more divinely in Plato.[b] The head he calls the citadel of the body, the neck is an isthmus built between the head and chest, and the vertebrae, he says, are planted beneath like hinges; pleasure is evil's bait for man, and the tongue is the touchstone of taste. The heart is a knot of veins and the source whence the blood runs vigorously round, and it has its station in the guardhouse of the body. The passageways of the body he calls alleys, and "for the leaping of the heart in the expectation of danger or the arising of wrath, since this was due to fire, the gods devised a support by implanting the lungs, making them a sort of buffer, soft and bloodless and full of pores inside, so that when anger boiled up in the heart it might throb against a yielding surface and suffer no damage." The seat of the desires he compares to the women's apartments and the seat of anger to the men's. The spleen

[a] Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.4.5.

[b] Plato, *Timaeus* 65C–85E, quoted selectively and with considerable freedom; see Russell (1964) pp. 153–5.

---

[1] κακῶν K marg., Manutius (cf. Cicero *de Senectute* 44, *escam malorum*): κακὸν P.

"ὅθεν πληρούμενος τῶν ἀποκαθαιρομένων μέγας καὶ ὕπουλος αὔξεται." "μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα σαρξὶ πάντα," φησί, "κατεσκίασαν, προβολὴν τῶν ἔξωθεν τὴν σάρκα, οἷον τὰ πιλήματα,[1] προθέμενοι." νομὴν δὲ σαρκῶν ἔφη τὸ αἷμα· "τῆς δὲ τροφῆς ἕνεκα," φησί, "διωχέτευσαν τὸ σῶμα, τέμνοντες ὥσπερ ἐν κήποις ὀχετούς, ὡς ἔκ τινος νάματος ἐπιόντος, ἀραιοῦ ὄντος αὐλῶνος τοῦ σώματος, τὰ τῶν φλεβῶν ῥέοι νάματα." ἡνίκα δὲ ἡ τελευτὴ παραστῇ, λύεσθαί φησι τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς οἱονεὶ νεὼς πείσματα, μεθεῖσθαί τε αὐτὴν
6 ἐλευθέραν. ταῦτα καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια μυρί' ἄττα ἐστὶν ἑξῆς· ἀπόχρη δὲ τὰ δεδηλωμένα, ὡς μεγάλαι τε φύσιν εἰσὶν αἱ τροπικαί, καὶ ὡς ὑψηλοποιὸν αἱ μεταφοραί, καὶ ὅτι οἱ παθητικοὶ καὶ φραστικοὶ κατὰ
7 τὸ πλεῖστον αὐταῖς χαίρουσι τόποι. ὅτι μέντοι καὶ ἡ χρῆσις τῶν τρόπων, ὥσπερ τἆλλα πάντα καλὰ ἐν λόγοις, προαγωγὸν ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄμετρον, δῆλον ἤδη, κἂν ἐγὼ μὴ λέγω. ἐπὶ γὰρ τούτοις καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα οὐχ ἥκιστα διασύρουσι, πολλάκις ὥσπερ ὑπὸ βακχείας τινὸς τῶν λόγων εἰς ἀκράτους καὶ ἀπηνεῖς μεταφορὰς καὶ εἰς ἀλληγορικὸν στόμφον ἐκφερόμενον. "οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον ἐπινοεῖν," φησίν, "ὅτι πόλιν εἶναι <δεῖ>[2] δίκην κρατῆρος κεκερασμένην, οὗ μαινόμενος μὲν οἶνος ἐγκεχυμένος ζεῖ, κολαζόμενος δ' ὑπὸ νήφοντος ἑτέρου θεοῦ καλὴν κοινωνίαν λαβὼν ἀγαθὸν πόμα καὶ μέτριον ἀπεργάζεται." νήφοντα

[1] πιλήματα Toup for πηδήματα.

again is the towel for the entrails, "with whose offscourings it is filled and becomes swollen and fetid." "After this," he goes on, "they shrouded the whole in a covering of flesh, like felt, to shield it from the outer world." Blood he calls the fodder of the flesh, and adds, "For purposes of nutriment they irrigated the body, cutting channels as one does in a garden, and thus, the body being a conduit full of passages, the streams in the veins were able to flow as it were from a running stream." And when the end comes, the soul, he says, is loosed like a ship from its moorings and set free. These and thousands of similar metaphors occur throughout. Those we have pointed out suffice to show that figurative writing[a] has a natural grandeur and that metaphors make for sublimity: also that emotional and descriptive passages are most glad of them. However, it is obvious without my stating it, that the use of metaphor, like all the other beauties of style, always tempts writers to excess. Indeed it is for these passages in particular that critics pull Plato to pieces, on the ground that he is often carried away by a sort of Bacchic possession in his writing into harsh and intemperate metaphor and allegorical bombast. "It is by no means easy to see," he says, "that a city needs mixing like a wine bowl, where the mad wine seethes as it is poured in, but is chastened by another and a sober god and finding good company makes an excellent and temperate drink."[b]

[a] This translation understands λέξεις with *τροπικαί*.

[b] Plato, *Laws* 6.773C.

---

[2] add. K marg., Manutius.

γάρ, φασί, θεὸν τὸ ὕδωρ λέγειν, κόλασιν δὲ τὴν κρᾶσιν, ποιητοῦ τινος τῷ ὄντι οὐχὶ νήφοντός ἐστι.

8 Τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐλαττώμασιν ἐπιχειρῶν ὅμως αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ Καικίλιος ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Λυσίου συγγράμμασιν ἀπεθάρρησεν τῷ παντὶ Λυσίαν ἀμείνω Πλάτωνος ἀποφήνασθαι, δυσὶ πάθεσι χρησάμενος ἀκρίτοις· φιλῶν γὰρ τὸν Λυσίαν ὡς οὐδ' αὐτὸς αὑτόν, ὅμως μᾶλλον μισεῖ τῷ παντὶ Πλάτωνα ἢ Λυσίαν φιλεῖ. πλὴν οὗτος μὲν ὑπὸ φιλονεικίας οὐδὲ τὰ θέματα ὁμολογούμενα, καθάπερ ᾠήθη. ὡς γὰρ ἀναμάρτητον καὶ καθαρὸν τὸν ῥήτορα προφέρει πολλαχῇ διημαρτημένου τοῦ Πλάτωνος· τὸ δ' ἦν ἄρα οὐχὶ τοιοῦτον, οὐδὲ ὀλίγου δεῖ.

33. Φέρε δή, λάβωμεν τῷ ὄντι καθαρόν τινα συγγραφέα καὶ ἀνέγκλητον. ἆρ' οὐκ ἄξιόν ἐστι διαπορῆσαι περὶ αὐτοῦ, τούτου καθολικῶς, πότερόν ποτε κρεῖττον ἐν ποιήμασι καὶ λόγοις μέγεθος ἐν ἐνίοις διημαρτημένον[1] ἢ τὸ σύμμετρον μὲν ἐν τοῖς κατορθώμασιν ὑγιὲς δὲ πάντη καὶ ἀδιάπτωτον; καὶ ἔτι νὴ Δία, πότερόν ποτε αἱ πλείους ἀρεταὶ τὸ πρωτεῖον ἐν λόγοις ἢ αἱ μείζους δικαίως ἂν φέροιντο;

2 ἔστι γὰρ ταῦτ' οἰκεῖα τοῖς περὶ ὕψους σκέμματα καὶ ἐπικρίσεως ἐξ ἅπαντος δεόμενα. ἐγὼ δ' οἶδα μέν, ὡς αἱ ὑπερμεγέθεις φύσεις ἥκιστα καθαραί· τὸ γὰρ ἐν παντὶ ἀκριβὲς κίνδυνος μικρότητος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεγέθεσιν, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἄγαν πλούτοις, εἶναί τι χρὴ

[1] διημαρτημένον K marg., Manutius: διημαρτημένοις P.

To call water "a sober god" and mixing "chastisement," say the critics, is the language of a poet who is far from sober.

Caecilius too, in attacking like defects, has actually had the face to declare in his book on Lysias that Lysias is altogether superior to Plato. Here he has given way to two confused emotions: for though he loves Lysias even better than himself, yet his hatred for Plato altogether outweighs his love for Lysias. However he is moved by a spirit of contentiousness and even his premises are not agreed, as he supposed. For he prefers his orator on the ground that he is immaculate[a] and never makes a mistake, whereas Plato is full of mistakes. But the truth, we find, is different, very different indeed.

33. Suppose we illustrate this by taking some altogether immaculate and unimpeachable writer, must we not in this very connection raise the general question: Which is the better in poetry and in prose, grandeur flawed in some respects, or moderate achievement accompanied by perfect soundness and impeccability? And again: is the first place in literature rightly due to the largest number of excellences or to the excellences that are greatest in themselves? These inquiries are proper to a treatise on the sublime and on every ground demand decision. Now I am well aware that the greatest natures are least immaculate. Perfect precision runs the risk of triviality, whereas in great writing as in great wealth there

[a] *Katharos*, i.e. "pure," in language, possessing one of the basic stylistic virtues.

καὶ παρολιγωρούμενον· μήποτε δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἀναγ-
καῖον ᾖ, τὸ τὰς μὲν ταπεινὰς καὶ μέσας φύσεις διὰ
τὸ μηδαμῆ παρακινδυνεύειν μηδὲ ἐφίεσθαι τῶν
ἄκρων ἀναμαρτήτους ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ ἀσφαλε-
στέρας διαμένειν, τὰ δὲ μεγάλα ἐπισφαλῆ δι' αὐτὸ
3 γίνεσθαι τὸ μέγεθος. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀγνοῶ
τὸ δεύτερον, ὅτι φύσει πάντα τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἀπὸ τοῦ
χείρονος ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἐπιγινώσκεται καὶ τῶν μὲν
ἁμαρτημάτων ἀνεξάλειπτος ἡ μνήμη παραμένει, τῶν
4 καλῶν δὲ ταχέως ἀπορρεῖ. παρατεθειμένος δ' οὐκ
ὀλίγα καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτήματα καὶ Ὁμήρου καὶ τῶν
ἄλλων ὅσοι μέγιστοι, καὶ ἥκιστα τοῖς παίσμασιν
ἀρεσκόμενος, ὅμως δὲ οὐχ ἁμαρτήματα μᾶλλον
αὐτὰ ἑκούσια καλῶν ἢ παροράματα δι' ἀμέλειαν
εἰκῇ που καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν ὑπὸ μεγαλοφυΐας ἀνεπιστά-
τως παρενηνεγμένα, οὐδὲν ἧττον οἶμαι τὰς μείζονας
ἀρετάς,[1] εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐν πᾶσι διομαλίζοιεν, τὴν τοῦ
πρωτείου ψῆφον μᾶλλον ἀεὶ φέρεσθαι, κἂν εἰ μὴ δι'
ἑνὸς ἑτέρου, τῆς μεγαλοφροσύνης αὐτῆς ἕνεκα· ἐπεί-
τοιγε καὶ ἄπτωτος ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναύ-
ταις ποιητὴς κἀν τοῖς βουκολικοῖς πλὴν ὀλίγων τῶν
ἔξωθεν ὁ Θεόκριτος ἐπιτυχέστατος· ἆρ' οὖν Ὅμηρος
5 ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι; τί δέ;
Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῇ Ἠριγόνῃ (διὰ πάντων γὰρ ἀμώ-
μητον τὸ ποιημάτιον) Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικο-
νόμητα παρασύροντος, κἀκείνης τῆς ἐκβολῆς τοῦ

[1] ἀρετάς Petra, for αἰτίας.

must needs be something overlooked. Perhaps it is inevitable that humble, mediocre natures, because they never run any risks and never aid at the heights, should remain to a large extent safe from error, while in great natures their very greatness spells danger. Not indeed that I am ignorant of the second point, that whatever men do is always inevitably regarded from the worst side: faults make an ineradicable impression, but beauties soon slip from our memory. I have myself cited a good many faults in Homer[a] and the other greatest authors, and though these slips certainly offend my taste, yet I prefer to call them not wilful mistakes but careless oversights, let in casually almost and at random by the heedlessness of genius. In spite, then, of these faults I still think that the greatest excellences, even if they are not sustained throughout at the same level, should always be voted the first place, if for nothing else, for the greatness of mind they reveal. Apollonius, for instance, is an impeccable poet in the *Argonautica*, and Theocritus—except in a few extraneous matters[b]—is supremely successful in his pastorals. Yet would you not rather be Homer than Apollonius? And what of Eratosthenes in his *Erigone*?[c] Wholly blameless as the little poem is, do you therefore think him a greater poet than Archilochus with all his disorganized flood and those outbursts of divine inspiration, which are

[a] Presumably in other works. [b] This refers either to the parts of Theocritus which are not pastoral or (more probably) to slips of factual detail noted by grammarians.

[c] A learned elegiac poem by the astronomer-poet (third century B.C.), in which was related the Attic myth of the death of Icarius and the suicide by hanging of his daughter Erigone, the principal characters being all translated into stars. See J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* 64ff.

δαιμονίου πνεύματος ἦν ὑπὸ νόμον τάξαι δύσκολον, ἆρα δὴ μείζων ποιητής; τί δέ; ἐν μέλεσι μᾶλλον ἂν εἶναι Βακχυλίδης ἕλοιο ἢ Πίνδαρος καὶ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ Ἴων ὁ Χῖος ἢ Δία Σοφοκλῆς; ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντη κεκαλλιγραφημένοι, ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὁτὲ μὲν οἷον πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, σβέννυνται δ' ἀλόγως πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀτυχέστατα. ἢ οὐδεὶς ἂν εὖ φρονῶν ἑνὸς δράματος, τοῦ Οἰδίποδος, εἰς ταὐτὸ συνθεὶς τὰ Ἴωνος <ἅπαντα>[1] ἀντιτιμήσαιτο ἑξῆς.

34. Εἰ δ' ἀριθμῷ, μὴ τῷ μεγέθει κρίνοιτο τὰ κατορθώματα, οὕτως ἂν καὶ Ὑπερείδης τῷ παντὶ προέχοι Δημοσθένους. ἔστιν γὰρ αὐτοῦ πολυφωνότερος καὶ πλείους ἀρετὰς ἔχων, καὶ σχεδὸν ὕπακρος ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς ὁ πένταθλος, ὥστε τῶν μὲν πρωτείων ἐν ἅπασι τῶν ἄλλων ἀγωνιστῶν λείπεσθαι, πρωτεύειν
2 δὲ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν. ὁ μέν γε Ὑπερείδης πρὸς τῷ πάντα ἔξω γε τῆς συνθέσεως μιμεῖσθαι τὰ Δημοσθένεια κατορθώματα καὶ τὰς Λυσιακὰς ἐκ περιττοῦ περιείληφεν ἀρετάς τε καὶ χάριτας· καὶ γὰρ λαλεῖ μετὰ ἀφελείας, ἔνθα χρή, καὶ οὐ πάντα ἑξῆς [καὶ][2] μονοτόνως, ὡς ὁ Δημοσθένης λέγεται, τό τε ἠθικὸν ἔχει μετὰ γλυκύτητος [ἡδὺ][3] λιτῶς ἐφηδυνόμενον· ἄφατοί τε περὶ αὐτόν εἰσιν ἀστεϊσμοί, μυκτὴρ πολιτικώτατος, εὐγένεια, τὸ κατὰ τὰς εἰρωνείας εὐπάλαιστρον,

[1] add. Toup.
[2] del. Schurzfleisch.
[3] del. Weiske: *νὴ Δία* Richards.

so troublesome to bring under any rule? In lyrics, again, would you choose to be Bacchylides rather than Pindar, or in tragedy Ion of Chios[a] rather than Sophocles? In both pairs the first named is impeccable and a master of elegance in the smooth style, while Pindar and Sophocles sometimes seem to fire the whole landscape as they sweep across it, though often their fire is unaccountably quenched and they fall miserably flat. The truth is rather that no one in his senses would give the single tragedy of *Oedipus* for all the works of Ion together.

34. If achievements were to be judged by the number of excellences and not by their greatness, Hyperides would then be altogether superior to Demosthenes. He has greater variety of voice and his excellences are more numerous. He may almost be said to come a good second in every competition, like the winner of the Pentathlon.[b] In each contest he loses to the professional champion, but comes first of the amateurs. Besides reproducing all the virtues of Demosthenes, except his skill in word arrangement, Hyperides has embraced all the excellences and graces of Lysias. He talks plainly, where necessary, does not speak always in the same tone, as Demosthenes is said to do, and has the power of characterization, seasoned moreover by simplicity and charm. Then he has an untold store of polished wit, urbane sarcasm, well-bred

[a] Ion of Chios (mid-fifth century B.C.) was better known for his prose works ("Memoirs" and "Visits of Famous Men"), but a number of his tragedies were known in Hellenistic times (*TGF* i pp. 95ff; A. von Blumenthal, *Ion von Chios* (1939)).

[b] The best result in all five contests taken together—jumping, running, discus, javelin, wrestling—would doubtless be achieved by an athlete who was not an outstanding performer in any one.

σκώμματα οὐκ ἄμουσα οὐδ' ἀνάγωγα, κατὰ τοὺς
Ἀττικοὺς ἐκείνους ἄλας[1] ἐπικείμενα, διασυρμός τε
ἐπιδέξιος καὶ πολὺ τὸ κωμικὸν καὶ μετὰ παιδιᾶς
εὐστόχου κέντρον, ἀμίμητον δὲ εἰπεῖν τὸ ἐν πᾶσι
τούτοις ἐπαφρόδιτον· οἰκτίσασθαί τε προσφυέστα-
τος, ἔτι δὲ μυθολογῆσαι κεχυμένως[2] καὶ ἐν ὑγρῷ
πνεύματι διεξοδεῦσαί τι[3] εὐκαμπὴς ἄκρως, ὥσπερ
ἀμέλει τὰ μὲν περὶ τὴν Λητὼ ποιητικώτερα, τὸν δ'
3 ἐπιτάφιον ἐπιδεικτικῶς, ὡς οὐκ οἶδ' εἴ τις ἄλλος, διέ-
θετο. ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης ἀνηθοποίητος ἀδιάχυτος,
ἥκιστα ὑγρὸς ἢ ἐπιδεικτικός, ἁπάντων ἐξῆς τῶν
προειρημένων κατὰ τὸ πλέον ἄμοιρος, ἔνθα μὲν
γελοῖος εἶναι βιάζεται καὶ ἀστεῖος, οὐ γέλωτα κινεῖ
μᾶλλον ἢ καταγελᾶται, ὅταν δὲ ἐγγίζειν θέλῃ τῷ
ἐπίχαρις εἶναι, τότε πλέον ἀφίσταται. τό γέ τοι
περὶ Φρύνης ἢ Ἀθηνογένους λογίδιον ἐπιχειρήσας
4 γράφειν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἂν Ὑπερείδην συνέστησεν.
ἀλλ' ἐπειδήπερ, οἶμαι, τὰ μὲν θατέρου καλά, καὶ εἰ
πολλὰ ὅμως ἀμεγέθη, καρδίᾳ νήφοντος ἀργὰ καὶ

[1] ἄλας Tucker for ἀλλὰ.
[2] κεχυμένως Blass, for κεχυμένος.
[3] τι Buecheler, for ἔτι.

---

[a] Hyperides' lost *Deliacus* (frr. 67–75 Kenyon; the date is about 343 B.C.) upheld the Athenian claim to the presidency of the temple at Delos, where Leto gave birth to Apollo and Artemis.

[b] The *Funeral Oration* (*Oration* 6) 322 B.C., on those who fell in the Lamian War, is extant on a papyrus first published in 1858.

elegance, supple turns of irony, jests neither tasteless nor ill-bred, well-dressed with wit like the Attic masters, clever satire, plenty of pointed ridicule and well-directed fun, and in all this a quite indescribable charm. Nature endowed him fully with the power of evoking pity and also with a superb flexibility in narrating myths copiously, and pursuing a theme with fluency. His story of Leto,[a] for instance, is in a more poetical vein, while his Funeral Oration[b] is as good a piece of epideictic composition as anyone could produce. Demosthenes, on the other hand, has no gift of characterization or of fluency, is far from facile, and no epideictic orator. In fact he has no part in any one of the qualities we have just mentioned. When he is forced into attempting a jest or a witty passage, he rather raises the laugh against himself; and when he tries to approximate charm, he is farther from it than ever. If he had tried to write the little speech on Phryne[c] or Athenogenes,[d] he would have been an even better advertisement for Hyperides. But nevertheless I feel that the beauties of Hyperides, many as they are, yet lack grandeur; "inert in the heart of a sober man,"[e] they

[c] Hyperides' defence of the courtesan Phryne (frr. 171–80 Kenyon) is lost, but was famous for the peroration, in which Phryne's charms were displayed to the court (Athenaeus 13.590E).

[d] *Against Athenogenes* (*Oration* 3, a large part of which survives in a papyrus published in 1892) concerns a contract for the purchase of slaves; it is lively and full of character, but the case is a complicated one.

[e] Proverbial and perhaps a verse quotation.

τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἠρεμεῖν ἐῶντα (οὐδεὶς γοῦν Ὑπερείδην ἀναγινώσκων φοβεῖται), ὁ δὲ ἔνθεν ἐλὼν τοῦ μεγαλοφυεστάτου καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρον ἀρετὰς συντετελεσμένας, ὑψηγορίας τόνον, ἔμψυχα πάθη, περιουσίαν ἀγχίνοιαν τάχος, ἔνθα δὴ καίριον,[1] τὴν ἅπασιν ἀπρόσιτον δεινότητα καὶ δύναμιν, ἐπειδὴ ταῦτα, φημί, ὡς θεόπεμπτά τινα[2] δωρήματα (οὐ γὰρ εἰπεῖν θεμιτὸν ἀνθρώπινα) ἀθρόα ἐς ἑαυτὸν ἔσπασεν, διὰ τοῦτο οἷς ἔχει καλοῖς ἅπαντας ἀεὶ νικᾷ καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν οὐκ ἔχει καὶ ὡσπερεὶ καταβροντᾷ καὶ καταφέγγει τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ῥήτορας· καὶ θᾶττον ἄν τις κεραυνοῖς φερομένοις ἀντανοῖξαι τὰ ὄμματα δύναιτο ἢ ἀντοφθαλμῆσαι τοῖς ἐπαλλήλοις ἐκείνου πάθεσιν.

35. Ἐπὶ μέντοι τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ ἄλλη τίς ἐστιν, ὡς ἔφην, διαφορά. οὐ γὰρ μεγέθει τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πλήθει πολὺ λειπόμενος αὐτοῦ Λυσίας ὅμως[3] πλεῖον ἔτι τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν περιττεύει ἢ ταῖς ἀρε-
2 ταῖς λείπεται. τί ποτ' οὖν εἶδον οἱ ἰσόθεοι ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἐπορεξάμενοι τῆς συγγραφῆς, τῆς δ' ἐν ἅπασιν ἀκριβείας ὑπερφρονήσαντες; πρὸς πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι ἡ φύσις οὐ ταπεινὸν ἡμᾶς ζῷον οὐδ' ἀγεννὲς ἔκρινε[4] τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰς μεγάλην τινὰ πανήγυριν εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον ἐπάγουσα θεατάς τινας τῶν

[1] *καίριον* Richards for *κύριον*: *εἶθ'*, ὃ δὴ *κύριον* Rohde.
[2] *τινα* Manutius for δεινὰ.
[3] ὅμως Toup for ὁ *μὲν*.
[4] ἔκτισε Seager.

do not trouble the peace of the audience. No one feels frightened while reading Hyperides. But Demosthenes no sooner "takes up the tale"[a] than he shows the merits of great genius in their most consummate form, sublime intensity, living emotion, redundance, readiness, speed—where speed is in season—and his own unapproachable vehemence and power: concentrating in himself all these heaven-sent gifts—it would be impious to call them human—he thus uses the beauties he possesses to win a victory over all others that even compensates for his weaknesses, and out-thunders, as it were, and outshines orators of every age. You could sooner open your eyes to the descent of a thunderbolt than face his repeated outbursts of emotion without blinking.

35. There is, as I said,[b] a further point of difference as compared with Plato. Lysias is far inferior to him both in the greatness and number of his excellences; yet the abundance of his faults is still greater than his deficiency in excellences. What then was the vision of those demigods who aimed only at what is greatest in writing and scorned detailed accuracy? This above all: that Nature has judged man[c] a creature of no mean or ignoble quality, but, as if she were inviting us to some great gathering, she has called us into life, into the whole universe, there to be spectators of her games and eager competi-

[a] A Homeric phrase (*Odyssey* 8.500).

[b] In chap. 32.

[c] If this reading is right, Nature "admits" men as spectators and competitors in the games of life: but Seager's conjecture—"created"—may well be right.

ἄθλων[1] αὐτῆς ἐσομένους καὶ φιλοτιμοτάτους ἀγωνιστάς, εὐθὺς ἄμαχον ἔρωτα ἐνέφυσεν ἡμῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς παντὸς ἀεὶ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς
3 δαιμονιωτέρου. διόπερ τῇ θεωρίᾳ καὶ διανοίᾳ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπιβολῆς οὐδ' ὁ σύμπας κόσμος ἀρκεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τοῦ περιέχοντος πολλάκις ὅρους ἐκβαίνουσιν αἱ ἐπίνοιαι· καὶ εἴ τις περιβλέψαιτο ἐν κύκλῳ τὸν βίον, ὅσῳ πλέον ἔχει τὸ περιττὸν ἐν πᾶσι καὶ μέγα καὶ καλόν, ταχέως εἴσεται πρὸς ἃ γεγόνα-
4 μεν. ἔνθεν φυσικῶς πως ἀγόμενοι μὰ Δί' οὐ τὰ μικρὰ ῥεῖθρα θαυμάζομεν, εἰ καὶ διαυγῆ καὶ χρήσιμα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Νεῖλον καὶ Ἴστρον ἢ Ῥῆνον, πολὺ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον τὸν Ὠκεανόν, οὐδέ γε τὸ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τουτὶ φλογίον ἀνακαιόμενον, ἐπεὶ καθαρὸν σῴζει τὸ φέγγος, ἐκπληττόμεθα τῶν οὐρανίων μᾶλλον, καίτοι πολλάκις ἐπισκοτουμένων, οὐδὲ τῶν τῆς Αἴτνης κρατήρων ἀξιοθαυμαστότερον νομίζομεν, ἧς αἱ ἀναχοαὶ πέτρους τε ἐκ βυθοῦ καὶ ὅλους ὄχθους ἀναφέρουσι καὶ ποταμοὺς ἐνίοτε τοῦ γηγενοῦς[2] ἐκείνου καὶ
5 αὐτομάτου[3] προχέουσιν πυρός. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἁπάντων ἐκεῖν' ἂν εἴποιμεν, ὡς εὐπόριστον μὲν ἀνθρώποις τὸ χρειῶδες ἢ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον, θαυμαστὸν δ' ὅμως ἀεὶ τὸ παράδοξον.

36. Οὐκοῦν ἐπί γε τῶν ἐν λόγοις μεγαλοφυῶν, ἐφ' ὧν οὐκέτ' ἔξω τῆς χρείας καὶ ὠφελείας πίπτει τὸ μέγεθος, προσήκει συνθεωρεῖν αὐτόθεν, ὅτι τοῦ ἀναμαρτήτου πολὺ ἀφεστῶτες οἱ τηλικοῦτοι ὅμως παντός[4] εἰσιν ἐπάνω τοῦ θνητοῦ· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τοὺς

tors; and she therefore from the first breathed into our hearts an unconquerable passion for whatever is great and more divine than ourselves. Thus the whole universe is not enough to satisfy the speculative intelligence of human thought; our ideas often pass beyond the limits that confine us. Look at life from all sides and see how in all things the extraordinary, the great, the beautiful stand supreme, and you will soon realize what we were born for. So it is by some natural instinct that we admire, not the small streams, clear and useful as they are, but the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and above all the Ocean. The little fire we kindle for ourselves keeps clear and steady, yet we do not therefore regard it with more amazement than the fires of Heaven, which are often darkened, or think it more wonderful than the craters of Etna in eruption, hurling up rocks and whole hills from their depths and sometimes shooting forth rivers of that earthborn, spontaneous fire. But on all such matters I would only say this, that what is useful or necessary is easily obtained by man; it is always the unusual which wins our wonder.

36. In dealing, then, with writers of genius, whose grandeur is of a kind that comes within the limits of use and profit, we must at the outset observe that, while they are far from unerring, yet they are above all mortal range.

---

[1] *ἄθλων* Reiske for *ὅλων*.

[2] *γηγενοῦς* Markland, for *γένους*.

[3] *αὐτομάτου* Haupt, for *αὐτοῦ μόνου*.

[4] *παντός* Pearce, for *πάντες*.

χρωμένους ἀνθρώπους ἐλέγχει, τὸ δ' ὕψος ἐγγὺς αἴρει μεγαλοφροσύνης θεοῦ. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄπταιστον
2 οὐ ψέγεται, τὸ μέγα δὲ καὶ θαυμάζεται. τί χρὴ πρὸς τούτοις ἔτι λέγειν ὡς ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἕκαστος ἅπαντα τὰ σφάλματα ἑνὶ ἐξωνεῖται πολλάκις ὕψει καὶ κατορθώματι, καὶ τὸ κυριώτατον, ὡς, εἴ τις[1] ἐκλέξας τὰ Ὁμήρου, τὰ Δημοσθένους, τὰ Πλάτωνος, τῶν ἄλλων ὅσοι δὴ μέγιστοι, παραπτώματα πάντα ὁμόσε συναθροίσειεν, ἐλάχιστον ἄν τι, μᾶλλον δ' οὐδὲ πολλοστημόριον ἂν εὑρεθείη τῶν ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἥρωσι πάντη κατορθουμένων. διὰ ταῦθ' ὁ πᾶς αὐτοῖς αἰὼν καὶ βίος, οὐ δυνάμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ φθόνου παρανοίας ἁλῶναι, φέρων ἀπέδωκεν τὰ νικητήρια καὶ ἄχρι νῦν ἀναφαίρετα φυλάττει καὶ ἔοικε τηρήσειν,

ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε ῥέῃ καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ
τεθήλῃ.[a]

3 πρὸς μέντοι γε τὸν γράφοντα, ὡς ὁ κολοσσὸς ὁ ἡμαρτημένος οὐ κρείττων ἢ ὁ Πολυκλείτου δορυφόρος, παράκειται πρὸς πολλοῖς εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἐπὶ μὲν τέχνης θαυμάζεται τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν φυσικῶν ἔργων τὸ μέγεθος, φύσει δὲ λογικὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος· κἀπὶ μὲν ἀνδριάντων ζητεῖται τὸ ὅμοιον ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ λόγου τὸ ὑπεραῖρον, ὡς ἔφην,

[1] τις K marg., Manutius for γε.

[a] Quoted in Plato (*Phaedrus* 264C) as part of an epitaph said

Other qualities prove their possessors men, sublimity lifts them near the mighty mind of God. Correctness escapes censure: greatness earns admiration as well. We need hardly add that each of these great men again and again redeems all his mistakes by a single touch of sublimity and true excellence; and, what is finally decisive, if we were to pick out all the faults in Homer, Demosthenes, Plato, and all the other greatest authors and put them together, we should find them a tiny part, not the smallest fraction, of the true successes to be found everywhere in the work of these heroes. That is why the judgement of all ages, which no jealousy can convict of mental incompetence, has awarded them the crown of victory, guards it as their irremovable possession, and is likely to preserve it,

> So long as the rivers run and the tall trees flourish and grow.[a]

As to the statement that the faulty Colossus[b] is no better than the Doryphorus of Polyclitus,[c] there are many obvious answers to that. For one thing, we admire accuracy in art, grandeur in nature; and it is Nature that has given man the power of using words. Also we expect a statue to resemble a man, but in literature, as I said before, we

to have been written for Midas. See *Anthologia Palatina* 7.153.

[b] Perhaps the Colossus of Rhodes, damaged in an earthquake when it had stood for sixty years; but more probably any colossal statue: cf. Strabo 1.1.23, who speaks of *kolossoi* in which the total effect is all-important, and the accuracy of the detail insignificant.

[c] The statue of the boy with a lance by Polyclitus of Argos was regarded as a model of beautiful proportions (Pliny, *Natural History* 34.55).

4 τὰ ἀνθρώπινα. προσήκει δ' ὅμως (ἀνακάμπτει γὰρ
ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡμῖν τοῦ ὑπομνήματος ἡ παραίνεσις
ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τέχνης
ἐστὶ κατόρθωμα, τὸ δ' ἐν ὑπεροχῇ πλὴν οὐχ ὁμότονον μεγαλοφυΐας, βοήθημα τῇ φύσει πάντη πορίζεσθαι τὴν τέχνην· ἡ γὰρ ἀλληλουχία τούτων ἴσως γένοιτ' ἂν τὸ τέλειον. τοσαῦτα ἦν ἀναγκαῖον ὑπὲρ τῶν προτεθέντων ἐπικρῖναι σκεμμάτων· χαιρέτω ὁ ἕκαστος οἷς ἥδεται.

37. Ταῖς δὲ μεταφοραῖς γειτνιῶσιν (ἐπανιτέον γάρ) αἱ παραβολαὶ καὶ εἰκόνες, ἐκείνῃ μόνον παραλλάττουσαι . . .

38. <καταγελα>στοὶ[1] καὶ αἱ τοιαῦται· "εἰ μὴ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἐν ταῖς πτέρναις καταπεπατημένον φορεῖτε." διόπερ εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸ μέχρι ποῦ παροριστέον ἕκαστον· τὸ γὰρ ἐνίοτε περαιτέρω προεκπίπτειν ἀναιρεῖ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ὑπερτεινόμενα χαλᾶται, ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ εἰς ὑπεναντιώσεις
2 ἀντιπεριΐσταται. ὁ γοῦν Ἰσοκράτης οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως παιδὸς πρᾶγμα ἔπαθεν διὰ τὴν τοῦ πάντα αὐξητικῶς ἐθέλειν λέγειν φιλοτιμίαν. ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὑπόθεσις αὐτῷ τοῦ πανηγυρικοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἡ Ἀθηναίων πόλις, ταῖς εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας εὐεργεσίαις ὑπερβάλλει τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων, ὁ δ' εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ ταῦτα τίθησιν· "ἔπειθ' οἱ λόγοι τοσαύτην ἔχουσι δύναμιν, ὥσθ' οἷόν τ' εἶναι καὶ τὰ μεγάλα ταπεινὰ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοῖς μικροῖς περιθεῖναι μέγεθος καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καινῶς εἰπεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν νεωστὶ γεγενημένων

ɔk for something greater than human. However (this .vice reverts to something with which we began our ɔatise), since impeccable correctness is, generally ,eaking, due to art, and the height of excellence, even if ,ratic, to genius, it is proper that art should always assist ature. Their cooperation may well result in perfection. ·is much had to be said to decide the questions before But everyone is welcome to his own taste.

37. Closely akin to metaphors (to return to them) are mparisons and similes. The only difference is . . .

[*Two pages are lost here.*]

38. . . . Laughable[a] also are such things as "If you do t carry your brains trodden down in your heels."[b] One must know, then, where to draw the line in each case. The hyperbole is sometimes ruined by overshooting the ark. Overdo the strain and the thing sags, and often oduces the opposite effect to that intended. For stance, Isocrates fell into unaccountable puerility through his ambition to amplify everything. The theme of his *Panegyric* is that Athens surpasses Sparta in her benefits to Greece. But at the very outset he puts this: Moreover words have such power that they can make great things humble and endue small things with greatness, give a new guise to what is old, and describe recent

[a] This assumes Reiske's supplement.

[b] [Demosthenes] *Oration* 7.45.

---

[1] Reiske.

ἀρχαίως διελθεῖν"—οὐκοῦν, φησί τις, Ἰσόκρατες, οὕτως μέλλεις καὶ τὰ περὶ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἐναλλάττειν; σχεδὸν γὰρ τὸ τῶν λόγων ἐγκώμιον ἀπιστίας τῆς καθ' αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀκούουσι παράγ-
3 γελμα καὶ προοίμιον ἐξέθηκεν. μήποτ' οὖν ἄρισται τῶν ὑπερβολῶν, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σχημάτων προείπομεν, αἱ αὐτὸ τοῦτο διαλανθάνουσαι ὅτι εἰσὶν ὑπερβολαί. γίνεται δὲ τὸ τοιόνδε, ἐπειδὰν ὑπὸ ἐκπαθείας μεγέθει τινὶ συνεκφωνῶνται περιστάσεως, ὅπερ ὁ Θουκυδίδης ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ φθειρομένων ποιεῖ. "οἵ τε γὰρ Συρακούσιοι," φησίν, "ἐπικαταβάντες τοὺς ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ μάλιστα ἔσφαζον, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εὐθὺς διέφθαρτο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἐπίνετο ὁμοῦ τῷ πηλῷ ᾑματωμένον καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἔτι ἦν περιμάχητον." αἷμα καὶ πηλὸν πινόμενα ὅμως εἶναι περιμάχητα ἔτι ποιεῖ πιστὸν ἡ τοῦ πάθους ὑπεροχὴ καὶ
4 περίστασις. καὶ τὸ Ἡροδότειον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις ὅμοιον. "ἐν τούτῳ" φησίν "ἀλεξομένους μαχαίρῃσιν, ὅσοις αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐτύγχανον περιοῦσαι, καὶ χερσὶ καὶ στόμασι κατέχωσαν οἱ βάρβαροι <βάλλοντες>[1]." ἐνταῦθ', οἷόν ἐστι τὸ καὶ στόμασι μάχεσθαι πρὸς ὡπλισμένους καὶ ὁποῖόν τι τὸ κατακεχῶσθαι βέλεσιν, ἐρεῖς, πλὴν ὁμοίως ἔχει πίστιν· οὐ γὰρ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἕνεκα τῆς ὑπερβολῆς παραλαμβάνεσθαι δοκεῖ, ἡ ὑπερβολὴ δ' εὐλόγως γεννᾶσθαι
5 πρὸς τοῦ πράγματος. ἔστι γάρ, ὡς οὐ διαλείπω λέγων, παντὸς τολμήματος λεκτικοῦ λύσις καὶ παν-

[1] Add. Manutius, from Herodotus.

events in the style of long ago"[a]—"Why, Isocrates," one may say, "do you intend by this means to reverse the positions of the Spartans and the Athenians?" For his praise of the power of words has all but issued a prefatory warning to the audience that he himself is not to be believed. Perhaps then, as we said above of figures,[b] the best hyperbole is the one which conceals the very fact of its being a hyperbole. And this happens when it is uttered under stress of emotion to suit the circumstances of a great crisis. This is what Thucydides does in speaking of those who were killed in Sicily. "For the Syracusans went down and began to slaughter chiefly those in the river. The water was immediately tainted but none the less they kept on drinking it, foul though it was with mud and gore, and most of them were still ready to fight for it."[c] That a drink of mud and gore should yet still be worth fighting for is made credible only by the height of the emotion which the circumstances arouse. It is the same with Herodotus' description of those who fought at Thermopylae. "On this spot," he says, "while they defended themselves with daggers, such as still had daggers left, and with hands and teeth, the barbarians buried them under a shower of missiles."[d] Here you may well ask what is meant by actually "fighting with teeth" against armed men or being "buried" with missiles; yet it carries credence in the same way, because Herodotus does not seem to have introduced the incident to justify the hyperbole, but the hyperbole for the sake of the incident. As I am never tired of saying, to atone for a daring phrase the universal

[a] Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 8.
[b] See chap. 17. [c] Thucydides 7.84.
[d] Herodotus 7.225.

ἀκειά τις τὰ ἐγγὺς ἐκστάσεως ἔργα καὶ πάθη. ὅθεν καὶ τὰ κωμικὰ καίτοιγ' εἰς ἀπιστίαν ἐκπίπτοντα πιθανὰ διὰ τὸ γελοῖον·

ἀγρὸν
ἔσχ' ἐλάττω γῆν ἔχοντ' ἐπιστολῆς
<Λακωνικῆς>[1]

6 καὶ γὰρ ὁ γέλως πάθος ἐν ἡδονῇ. αἱ δ' ὑπερβολαὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὔλαττον, ἐπειδὴ κοινὸν ἀμφοῖν ἡ ἐπίτασις· καί πως ὁ διασυρμὸς ταπεινότητός ἐστιν αὔξησις.

39. Ἡ πέμπτη μοῖρα τῶν συντελουσῶν εἰς τὸ ὕψος, ὧν γε ἐν ἀρχῇ προὐθέμεθα, ἔθ' ἡμῖν λείπεται, κράτιστε, ἦν δὲ[2] τῶν λόγων αὕτη ποιὰ σύνθεσις. ὑπὲρ ἧς ἐν δυσὶν ἀποχρώντως ἀποδεδωκότες συντάγμασιν, ὅσα γε τῆς θεωρίας ἦν ἡμῖν ἐφικτά, τοσοῦτον ἐξ ἀνάγκης προσθείημεν ἂν εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπόθεσιν, ὡς οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ πειθοῦς καὶ ἡδονῆς ἡ ἁρμονία φυσικὸν ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγαληγορίας καὶ πάθους θαυμαστόν τι ὄργανον.
2 οὐ γὰρ αὐλὸς μὲν ἐντίθησίν τινα πάθη τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις καὶ οἷον ἔκφρονας καὶ κορυβαντιασμοῦ πλήρεις ἀποτελεῖ, καὶ βάσιν ἐνδούς τινα ῥυθμοῦ πρὸς ταύτην ἀναγκάζει[3] βαίνειν ἐν ῥυθμῷ καὶ συνεξομοιοῦσθαι τῷ μέλει τὸν ἀκροατήν, κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ παντάπασι, καὶ νὴ Δία φθόγγοι κιθάρας, οὐδὲν ἁπλῶς

[1] Add. Portus (1569).

specific is found in actions and feelings that almost make one beside oneself. Thus, too, comic expressions, even if they result in the incredible, yet sound convincing because they are laughable:

His field was shorter than a Spartan letter.[a]

Laughter indeed is an emotion based on pleasure. Hyperbole may tend to belittle as well as to magnify: the common element in both is a strain on the facts. In a sense too vilification is an amplification of the low and trivial.

39. Of those factors of sublimity which we specified at the beginning,[b] the fifth one still remains, good friend—this was the arrangement of the words themselves in a certain order. On this question I have in two books given a sufficient account of such conclusions as I could reach, and for our present purpose I need only add this, that men find in melody not only a natural instrument of persuasion and pleasure, but also a marvellous instrument of grandeur and emotion. The flute, for instance, induces certain emotions in those who hear it. It seems to carry them away and fill them with divine frenzy. It sets a particular rhythmic movement and forces them to move in rhythm. The hearer has to conform to the tune, though he may be utterly unmusical. Why, the very tones of the

[a] The brevity of Spartan messages was proverbial. The line is perhaps from comedy (cf. fr. adesp. 417–19 Kock).

[b] In chap. 8.

---

[2] Russell (1964), for ἡ διὰ.

[3] ἀναγκάζει Manutius, for ἀναγκάσει.

σημαίνοντες, ταῖς τῶν ἤχων μεταβολαῖς καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους κράσει[1] καὶ μίξει τῆς συμφωνίας
3 θαυμαστὸν ἐπάγουσι πολλάκις, ὡς ἐπίστασαι, θέλγητρον (καίτοι ταῦτα εἴδωλα καὶ μιμήματα νόθα ἐστὶ πειθοῦς, οὐχὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως, ὡς ἔφην, ἐνεργήματα γνήσια), οὐκ οἰόμεθα δ' ἄρα τὴν σύνθεσιν, ἁρμονίαν τινὰ οὖσαν λόγων ἀνθρώποις ἐμφύτων καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς, οὐχὶ τῆς ἀκοῆς μόνης ἐφαπτομένων, ποικίλας κινοῦσαν ἰδέας ὀνομάτων νοήσεων πραγμάτων κάλλους εὐμελείας, πάντων ἡμῖν ἐντρόφων καὶ συγγενῶν, καὶ ἅμα τῇ μίξει καὶ πολυμορφίᾳ τῶν ἑαυτῆς φθόγγων τὸ παρεστὼς τῷ λέγοντι πάθος εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πέλας παρεισάγουσαν καὶ εἰς μετουσίαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἀεὶ παθιστᾶσαν, τῇ τε τῶν λέξεων ἐποικοδομήσει τὰ μεγέθη συναρμόζουσαν, δι' αὐτῶν τούτων κηλεῖν[2] τε ὁμοῦ καὶ πρὸς ὄγκον τε καὶ ἀξίωμα καὶ ὕψος καὶ πᾶν ὃ ἐν αὐτῇ[3] περιλαμβάνει καὶ ἡμᾶς ἑκάστοτε συνδιατιθέναι, παντοίως ἡμῶν τῆς διανοίας ἐπικρα-
4 τοῦσαν; ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μανία τὸ περὶ τῶν οὕτως ὁμολογουμένων διαπορεῖν (ἀποχρῶσα γὰρ ἡ πεῖρα πίστις), ὑψηλόν γέ που δοκεῖ[4] νόημα καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι θαυμάσιον, ὃ τῷ ψηφίσματι ὁ Δημοσθένης ἐπιφέρει "τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν τότε τῇ πόλει περιστάντα κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὥσπερ νέφος," ἀλλ' αὐτῆς τῆς διανοίας οὐκ ἔλαττον τῇ ἁρμονίᾳ πεφώνηται. ὅλον τε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν δακτυλικῶν εἴρηται ῥυθμῶν, εὐγενέστατοι δ' οὗτοι καὶ μεγεθοποιοί, διὸ

harp, themselves meaningless, by the variety of their sounds and by their combination and harmonious blending often exercise, as you know, a marvellous spell. (Yet these are only a bastard counterfeit of persuasion, not, as I said above, a genuine activity of human nature.) Must we not think, then, that composition, which is a kind of melody in words—words which are part of man's nature and reach not his ears only but his very soul—stirring as it does myriad ideas of words, thoughts, things, beauty, musical charm, all of which are born and bred in us, and by the blending of its own manifold tones, bringing into the hearts of the bystanders the speaker's actual emotion so that all who hear him share in it, and by piling phrase on phrase builds up one majestic whole—must we not think, I say, that by these very means it casts a spell on us and always turns *our* thoughts towards what is majestic and dignified and sublime and all else that it embraces, winning a complete mastery over our minds? Now it may indeed seem lunacy to raise any question on matters of such agreement, since experience is a sufficient test, yet surely the idea which Demosthenes applies to his decree strikes one as sublime and truly marvellous: "This decree made the peril at that time encompassing the country pass away like as a cloud."[a] But its effect is due no less to the harmony than to the thought. Its delivery rests wholly on the dactyls, which are the noblest of rhythms and

[a] *De corona* 188.

---

[1] K marg., Pearce, for κρούσει.
[2] κηλεῖν K marg., Manutius, for καλεῖν.
[3] αὐτῇ Toll, for αὐτῇ.
[4] που δοκεῖ Reiske, for τοῦ δοκεῖν.

καὶ τὸ ἡρῷον ὧν ἴσμεν κάλλιστον μέτρον συνιστᾶσι· [τό τε][1] ἐπείτοιγε ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτὸ χώρας μετάθες ὅποι δὴ ἐθέλεις "τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα ὥσπερ νέφος ἐποίησε τὸν τότε κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν," ἢ νὴ Δία μίαν ἀπόκοψον συλλαβὴν μόνον "ἐποίησε παρελθεῖν ὡς νέφος," καὶ εἴσῃ, πόσον ἡ ἁρμονία τῷ ὕψει συνηχεῖ. αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ "ὥσπερ νέφος" ἐπὶ μακροῦ τοῦ πρώτου ῥυθμοῦ βέβηκε, τέτρασι καταμετρουμένου[2] χρόνοις· ἐξαιρεθείσης δὲ τῆς μιᾶς συλλαβῆς "ὡς νέφος" εὐθὺς ἀκρωτηριάζει τῇ συγκοπῇ τὸ μέγεθος, ὡς ἔμπαλιν, ἐὰν ἐπεκτείνῃς "παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὡσπερεὶ[3] νέφος," τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνει, οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ἔτι προσπίπτει, ὅτι τῷ μήκει τῶν ἄκρων χρόνων συνεκλύεται καὶ διαχαλᾶται τὸ ὕψος τὸ ἀπότομον.

40. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς μάλιστα μεγεθοποιεῖ τὰ λεγόμενα, καθάπερ τὰ σώματα ἡ τῶν μελῶν ἐπισύνθεσις, ὧν ἓν μὲν οὐδὲν τμηθὲν ἀφ' ἑτέρου καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἀξιόλογον ἔχει, πάντα δὲ μετ' ἀλλήλων ἐκπληροῖ τέλειον σύστημα· οὕτως τὰ μεγάλα σκεδασθέντα μὲν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἄλλοσ' ἄλλῃ ἅμα ἑαυτοῖς συνδιαφορεῖ καὶ τὸ ὕψος, σωματοποιούμενα δὲ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ ἔτι δεσμῷ τῆς ἁρμονίας περικλειόμενα, αὐτῷ τῷ κύκλῳ φωνήεντα γίνεται· καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις ἔρα-
2 νός ἐστι πλήθους τὰ μεγέθη. ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι γε πολ-

[1] Manutius omitted *τό τε*; Pearce and others propose a lacuna to follow it, e.g. *τό τε <τελευταῖον κόμμα θαυμαστῶς συντέτακται>* Mazzucchi.

make for grandeur—and that is why the most beautiful of all known metres, the heroic, is composed of dactyls. Change the position of the phrase[a] to any place you like—*τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα ὥσπερ νέφος ἐποίησε τὸν τότε κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν*—or simply cut off a single syllable—*ἐποίησε παρελθεῖν ὡς νέφος*—and you will realize how truly the harmony chimes in with the sublimity. Indeed the actual phrase *ὥσπερ νέφος* rests on its long first rhythmical element, equivalent to four beats. Cut out the one syllable—*ὡς νέφος*—and the curtailment at once mutilates the grandeur. So again if you lengthen it—*παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὡσπερεὶ νέφος*—the meaning is the same, but it does not strike the same upon the ear, because the sheer sublimity is broken up and loosened by the breaking up of the longs in the final syllables.[b]

40. Nothing is of greater service in giving grandeur to what is said than the organization of the various members. It is the same with the human body. None of the members has any value by itself apart from the others, yet one with another they all constitute a perfect system. Similarly if these effects of grandeur are separated, the sublimity is scattered with them: but if they are united into a single whole and embraced by the bonds of rhythm, then they gain a living voice just by being merely rounded into a period. In a period, one might say, the grandeur

[a] I.e. the words *ὥσπερ νέφος*.

[b] I.e. both the proposed changes involve losing the effect of *ὥσπερ* as two longs.

---

[2] *καταμετρουμένου* Toll for *καταμετρούμενον*.

[3] *ὡσπερεὶ* K marg. for *ὥσπερ*.

λοὶ καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν οὐκ ὄντες ὑψηλοὶ φύσει, μήποτε δὲ καὶ ἀμεγέθεις, ὅμως κοινοῖς καὶ δημώδεσι τοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπαγομένοις περιττὸν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ συγχρώμενοι, διὰ μόνου τοῦ συνθεῖναι καὶ ἁρμόσαι ταῦτα δεόντως[1] ὄγκον καὶ διάστημα καὶ τὸ μὴ ταπεινοὶ δοκεῖν εἶναι περιεβάλοντο, καθάπερ ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Φίλιστος, Ἀριστοφάνης ἔν τισιν, ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις Εὐριπίδης,
3 ἱκανῶς ἡμῖν δεδήλωται. μετά γέ τοι τὴν τεκνοκτονίαν Ἡρακλῆς φησι

γέμω κακῶν δὴ κοὐκέτ' ἔσθ' ὅποι τεθῇ.

σφόδρα δημῶδες τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀλλὰ γέγονεν ὑψηλὸν τῇ πλάσει ἀναλογοῦν· εἰ δ' ἄλλως αὐτὸ συναρμόσεις, φανήσεταί σοι, διότι τῆς συνθέσεως ποιητὴς
4 ὁ Εὐριπίδης μᾶλλόν ἐστιν ἢ τοῦ νοῦ. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς συρομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ ταύρου Δίρκης,

εἰ δέ που τύχοι
πέριξ ἑλίξας, εἶλκε <πάνθ'>[2] ὁμοῦ λαβὼν
γυναῖκα πέτραν δρῦν μεταλλάσσων ἀεί,

ἔστι μὲν γενναῖον καὶ τὸ λῆμμα, ἀδρότερον δὲ γέγονε τῷ τὴν ἁρμονίαν μὴ κατεσπεῦσθαι μηδ' οἷον ἐν ἀποκυλίσματι φέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ στηριγμούς τε

[1] δεόντως von Arnim for δ' ὅμως; but it may be best to make a lacuna after δ' (Mazzucchi).

[2] Add. Bergk.

comes from the multitude of contributors. We have indeed abundantly shown[a] that many writers both in prose and poetry, who are not by nature sublime, perhaps even the very opposite, while using for the most part current vulgar words, which suggests nothing out of the common, yet by the mere arrangement and fitting together of these properly have achieved dignity and distinction and a reputation for grandeur; Philistus,[b] for instance, among many others, Aristophanes occasionally, Euripides almost always. After the slaughter of his children Heracles says:

I am loaded with woes and have no room for more.[c]

The phrase is exceedingly ordinary, yet becomes sublime by being apt to the situation. If you put the passage together in any other way, you will realize that Euripides is a poet of word arrangement more than of ideas. Speaking of Dirce being torn apart by the bull, he says,

And if perchance it happened
To twist itself around, it dragged them all,
Woman and rock and oak, and juggled with them.[d]

The idea itself is a fine one, but it gains additional force from the fact that the rhythm is not hurried along or, as it

[a] Presumably in the (lost) work in two books referred to at 39.1.

[b] Sicilian historian of the fourth century, imitator of Thucydides: *FGrHist* 556.

[c] Euripides, *Hercules Furens* 1245.

[d] From *Antiope* (fr. 221 Nauck^2): Amphion and Zethus, having discovered that Antiope was their mother, inflict on the cruel queen Dirce the punishment she had intended for Antiope.

ἔχειν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ ἐξερείσματα τῶν χρόνων πρὸς ἑδραῖον διαβεβηκότα μέγεθος.

41. Μικροποιοῦν δ' οὐδὲν οὕτως ἐν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς ὡς ῥυθμὸς κεκλασμένος λόγων καὶ σεσοβημένος, οἷον δὴ πυρρίχιοι καὶ τροχαῖοι καὶ διχόρειοι, τέλεον εἰς ὀρχηστικὸν συνεκπίπτοντες. εὐθὺς γὰρ πάντα φαίνεται τὰ κατάρρυθμα κομψὰ καὶ μικροχαρῆ
2 [καὶ][1] ἀπαθέστατα διὰ τῆς ὁμοειδείας ἐπιπολάζοντα· καὶ ἔτι τούτων τὸ χείριστον ὅτι, ὥσπερ τὰ ᾠδάρια τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος ἀφέλκει καὶ ἐφ' αὑτὰ βιάζεται, οὕτως καὶ τὰ κατερρυθμισμένα τῶν λεγομένων οὐ τὸ τοῦ λόγου πάθος ἐνδίδωσι τοῖς ἀκούουσι, τὸ δὲ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ, ὡς ἐνίοτε προειδότας τὰς ὀφειλομένας καταλήξεις αὐτοὺς ὑποκρούειν τοῖς λέγουσι καὶ φθάνοντας ὡς ἐν χορῷ τινι προαποδιδό-
3 ναι τὴν βάσιν. ὁμοίως δὲ ἀμεγέθη καὶ τὰ λίαν συγκείμενα καὶ εἰς μικρὰ καὶ βραχυσύλλαβα συγκεκομμένα καὶ ὡσανεὶ γόμφοις τισὶν ἐπαλλήλοις κατ' ἐγκοπὰς καὶ σκληρότητας ἐπισυνδεδεμένα.

42. Ἔτι γε μὴν ὕψους μειωτικὸν καὶ ἡ ἄγαν τῆς φράσεως συγκοπή· πηροῖ γὰρ τὸ μέγεθος, ὅταν εἰς λίαν συνάγηται βραχύ· ἀκουέσθω δὲ νῦν μὴ τὰ [οὐ][2] δεόντως συνεστραμμένα, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἄντικρυς μικρὰ καὶ κατακεκερματισμένα· συγκοπὴ μὲν γὰρ
2 κολούει τὸν νοῦν, συντομία δ' ἐπ' εὐθύ. δῆλον δ' ὡς

[1] [καὶ] del. Russell (1964).
[2] Manutius omitted οὐ.

were, running on rollers, but the words prop one another up and are separated by intervals, so that they stand firm and give the impression of stable grandeur.[a]

41. Nothing damages an elevated passage so much as effeminate and agitated rhythm, pyrrhics (⏑ ⏑), for instance, and trochees (– ⏑ or ⏑ ⏑ ⏑), and dichorees (– ⏑ – ⏑), which fall into a regular dance rhythm. For all over-rhythmical passages at once become merely pretty and cheap, recurring monotonously without producing the slightest emotional effect. Moreover, the worst of it is that, just as songs divert the attention of the audience from the action and forcibly claim it for themselves, so, too, over-rhythmical prose gives the audience the effect not of the words but of the rhythm. Thus they sometimes foresee the due ending themselves and keep time with their feet, anticipating the speaker and setting the step as if it were a dance. Equally deficient in grandeur are those passages which are too close-packed and concise, broken up into tiny fragments and short syllables. They give the impression of being bolted together, as it were, at frequent intervals with rough and uneven joins.

42. Extreme conciseness of expression also tends to diminish sublimity. The grandeur is mutilated by being too closely compressed. You must understand here not proper compression, but sentences which are, in absolute terms, small and fragmented. For extreme conciseness cripples the sense: true brevity goes straight to the point.

[a] The point is that combinations of consonants delay the smooth running of the words: note especially *perix helixas* and *petran drun* in the passage just quoted.

ἔμπαλιν τὰ ἐκτάδην ἀπόψυχα τὰ παρ'[1] ἄκαιρον μῆκος ἀναχαλώμενα.[2]

43. Δεινὴ δ' αἰσχῦναι τὰ μεγέθη καὶ ἡ μικρότης τῶν ὀνομάτων. παρὰ γοῦν τῷ Ἡροδότῳ κατὰ μὲν τὰ λήμματα δαιμονίως ὁ χειμὼν πέφρασται, τινὰ δὲ νὴ Δία περιέχει τῆς ὕλης ἀδοξότερα· καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἴσως "ζεσάσης δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης," ὡς τὸ "ζεσάσης" πολὺ τὸ ὕψος περισπᾷ, διὰ τὸ κακόστομον· ἀλλ' "ὁ ἄνεμος" φησίν "ἐκοπίασεν," καί "τοὺς περὶ τὸ ναυάγιον δρασσομένους ἐξεδέχετο τέλος ἄχαρι." ἄσεμνον γὰρ τὸ κοπιάσαι ἰδιωτικὸν <ὄν,>[3] τὸ δ'
2 ἀχάριστον τηλικούτου πάθους ἀνοίκειον. ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ Θεόπομπος ὑπερφυῶς σκευάσας τὴν τοῦ Πέρσου κατάβασιν ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον ὀνοματίοις τισὶ τὰ ὅλα διέβαλεν. "ποία γὰρ πόλις ἢ ποῖον ἔθνος τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν οὐκ ἐπρεσβεύετο πρὸς βασιλέα; τί δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς γεννωμένων ἢ τῶν κατὰ τέχνην ἐπιτελουμένων καλῶν ἢ τιμίων οὐκ ἐκομίσθη δῶρον ὡς αὐτόν; οὐ πολλαὶ μὲν καὶ πολυτελεῖς στρωμναὶ καὶ χλανίδες, τὰ μὲν ἁλουργῆ, τὰ δὲ ποικιλτά, τὰ δὲ λευκά, πολλαὶ δὲ σκηναὶ χρυσαῖ κατεσκευασμέναι πᾶσι τοῖς χρησίμοις, πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ ξυστίδες καὶ κλῖναι πολυτελεῖς; ἔτι δὲ καὶ κοῖλος ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσὸς ἀπειργασμένος καὶ ἐκπώματα καὶ κρατῆρες,

[1] παρ' ἄκαιρον Pearce, for γὰρ ἄκαιρον.
[2] ἀναχαλώμενα Toup, for ἀνακαλούμενα.
[3] <ὄν> add. Wilamowitz.

It is plain that the opposite holds of fully extended expressions; what is relaxed by unseasonable length is dead.

43. The use of trivial words also has a terribly debasing effect on a grand passage. The storm in Herodotus, for instance, is, as far as the ideas go, wonderfully described, but it includes certain things which are beneath the dignity of the subject. One might instance perhaps "the sea seething":[a] the word seething is so cacophonous that it takes off a great deal of the sublimity. But he does worse. "The wind," he says, "flagged," and "For those who were clinging to the wreck there awaited an unpleasant end."[b] "Flagged" is too colloquial a word to be dignified, and "unpleasant" ill befits so terrible a disaster. Similarly Theopompus,[c] after fitting out the Persian king's descent into Egypt in the most marvellous manner, discredited the whole description by the use of some paltry words. "For what city or what people of those in Asia did not send envoys to the king? What was there of beauty or of value whether born of the earth or perfected by art that was not brought as an offering to him? Were there not many costly coverlets and cloaks, some purple, some embroidered, some white; many pavilions of gold furnished with all things needful, many robes of state and costly couches? Then, moreover, there was plate of beaten silver and wrought gold, cups, and

[a] Herodotus 7.188.

[b] Herodotus 7.191, 8.13.

[c] Fr. 263a (*FGrHist*): the passage is quoted by Athenaeus (2.67F), but somewhat differently. It refers to the expedition of Artaxerxes Ochus against Egypt in the middle of the fourth century (cf. Diod. Sic. 16.44ff).

ὧν τοὺς μὲν λιθοκολλήτους, τοὺς δ' ἄλλως ἀκριβῶς καὶ πολυτελῶς εἶδες ἂν ἐκπεπονημένους. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀναρίθμητοι μὲν ὅπλων μυριάδες τῶν μὲν Ἑλληνικῶν, τῶν δὲ βαρβαρικῶν, ὑπερβάλλοντα δὲ τὸ πλῆθος ὑποζύγια καὶ πρὸς κατακοπὴν ἱερεῖα σιτευτά, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν ἀρτυμάτων μέδιμνοι, πολλοὶ δὲ θύλακοι καὶ σάκκοι καὶ χύτραι βυβλίων[1] καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων χρησίμων· τοσαῦτα δὲ κρέα τεταριχευμένα παντοδαπῶν ἱερείων, ὡς σωροὺς αὐτῶν γενέσθαι τηλικούτους, ὥστε τοὺς προσιόντας πόρρωθεν ὑπολαμβάνειν ὄχθους εἶναι καὶ λόφους ἀντω-
3 θουμένους." ἐκ τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων εἰς τὰ ταπεινότερα ἀποδιδράσκει, δέον ποιήσασθαι τὴν αὔξησιν ἔμπαλιν· ἀλλὰ τῇ θαυμαστῇ τῆς ὅλης παρασκευῆς ἀγγελίᾳ παραμίξας τοὺς θυλάκους καὶ τὰ ἀρτύματα καὶ τὰ σακκία μαγειρείου. τινὰ φαντασίαν ἐποίησεν. ὥσπερ γὰρ εἴ τις ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν προκοσμημάτων μεταξὺ τῶν χρυσίων καὶ λιθοκολλήτων κρατήρων καὶ ἀργύρου κοίλου σκηνῶν τε ὁλοχρύσων καὶ ἐκπωμάτων φέρων μέσα ἔθηκεν θυλάκια καὶ σακκία ἀπρεπὲς ἂν ἦν τῇ προσόψει τὸ ἔργον, οὕτω καὶ τῆς ἑρμηνείας τὰ τοιαῦτα ὀνόματα αἴσχη καὶ οἱονεὶ στίγματα καθίσταται παρὰ καιρὸν ἐγκατα-
4 ταττόμενα. παρέκειτο δ' ὡς ὁλοσχερῶς ἐπελθεῖν καὶ οὓς ὄχθους λέγει συμβεβλῆσθαι καὶ περὶ τῆς ἄλλης παρασκευῆς οὕτως ἀλλάξας εἰπεῖν καμήλους καὶ πλῆθος ὑποζυγίων φορταγωγούντων πάντα τὰ πρὸς τρυφὴν καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν τραπεζῶν χορηγήματα, ἢ

bowls, some of which you might have seen studded with jewels and others embellished by some other means both cunning and costly. Besides these there were countless myriads of weapons, some Greek, some barbarian; baggage animals beyond number, and victims fatted for slaughter; many bushels of spice, and many bags and sacks and pots of papyrus[a] and of all other things needful; and such a store of salted meat of every kind that it lay in heaps so large that those who approached from a distance took them for mounds and hills confronting them." He descends from the sublime to the trivial, where he needs rather a crescendo. As it is, by introducing bags and spices and sacks in the middle of his wonderful description of the whole equipage he has almost given the effect of a cook shop. Suppose that in all this show itself someone had brought bags and sacks and set them in the middle of the gold and jewelled bowls, the beaten silver, the pavilions of solid gold and the drinking cups—that would have presented an unseemly sight. In the same way the untimely introduction of such words as these disfigures the style, and puts a brand on it, as it were. He might have given a comprehensive description both of what he calls the heaped-up mounds and of the rest of the equipage by altering his description thus: "camels and a multitude of baggage animals laden with all that serves the luxury and pleasure of the table"; or he might

[a] Or onions, if we accept Toup's conjecture.

---

[1] Athenaeus (2.67f) has *πολλοὶ δὲ σάκκοι καὶ θύλακοι βιβλίων*; P has *πολλοὶ δ' οἱ θύλακοι καὶ σάκκοι καὶ χάρται βυβλίων*. Toup proposed *χύτραι βολβῶν*, "jars of onions," and the reference below to *μαγειρεῖον* perhaps supports this.

σωροὺς ὀνομάσαι παντοίων σπερμάτων καὶ τῶν ἅπερ διαφέρει πρὸς ὀψοποιΐας καὶ ἡδυπαθείας, ἢ εἴπερ πάντως ἐβούλετο αὐτὰ καὶ ῥητῶς[1] θεῖναι, καὶ ὅσα τραπεζοκόμων εἰπεῖν καὶ ὀψοποιῶν ἡδύσματα. οὐ γὰρ δεῖ καταντᾶν ἐν τοῖς ὕψεσιν εἰς τὰ ῥυπαρὰ καὶ ἐξυβρισμένα, ἂν μὴ σφόδρα ὑπό τινος ἀνάγκης συνδιωκώμεθα, ἀλλὰ τῶν πραγμάτων πρέποι ἂν καὶ τὰς φωνὰς ἔχειν ἀξίας καὶ μιμεῖσθαι τὴν δημιουργήσασαν φύσιν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἥτις ἐν ἡμῖν τὰ μέρη τὰ ἀπόρρητα οὐκ ἔθηκεν ἐν προσώπῳ οὐδὲ τὰ τοῦ παντὸς ὄγκου περιηθήματα,[2] ἀπεκρύψατο δὲ ὡς ἐνῆν καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ξενοφῶντα τοὺς τούτων ὅτι πορρωτάτω ὀχετοὺς ἀπέστρεψεν, οὐδαμῇ καταισχύνασα τὸ τοῦ ὅλου ζῴου κάλλος. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ ἐπ' εἴδους[3] ἐπείγει τὰ μικροποιὰ διαριθμεῖν· προϋποδεδειγμένων γὰρ τῶν ὅσα εὐγενεῖς καὶ ὑψηλοὺς ἐργάζεται τοὺς λόγους, δῆλον ὡς τὰ ἐναντία τούτων ταπεινοὺς ποιήσει κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον καὶ ἀσχήμονας.

44. Ἐκεῖνο μέντοι λοιπὸν ἕνεκα τῆς σῆς χρηστομαθείας οὐκ ὀκνήσομεν ἐπιπροσθεῖναι[4] <καὶ>[5] διασαφῆσαι, Τερεντιανὲ φίλτατε, ὅπερ ἐζήτησέ τις τῶν φιλοσόφων πρὸς <ἐμὲ> ἔναγχος,[6] "θαῦμά μ' ἔχει," λέγων, "ὡς ἀμέλει καὶ ἑτέρους πολλούς, πῶς ποτε κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον αἰῶνα πιθαναὶ μὲν ἐπ' ἄκρον καὶ πολιτικαί, δριμεῖαί τε καὶ ἐντρεχεῖς καὶ μάλιστα πρὸς ἡδονὰς λόγων εὔφοροι, ὑψηλαὶ δὲ λίαν καὶ

[1] So Richards for αὐτάρκη οὕτως P; perhaps αὐτὰ ἀκριβῶς (cf. ταῦτα ἀκριβῆ οὕτως, Mazzucchi).

have called them "heaps of every kind of grain and of all known aids to cookery and good living"; or, if he must at all hazards be explicit, "all the dainties known to caterers and cooks." One ought not in elevated passages to descend to what is sordid and contemptible, except under the severe pressure of necessity, but the proper course is to suit the words to the dignity of the subject and thus imitate Nature, the artist that created man. Nature did not place in full view our dishonourable parts nor the drains that purge our whole frame, but as far as possible concealed them and, as Xenophon says,[a] thrust their channels into the furthest background, for fear of spoiling the beauty of the whole creature. There is, however, no immediate need for enumerating and classifying the factors of mean style in detail. As we have already laid down all the qualities that make our utterance noble and sublime, it obviously follows that the opposite of these will generally make it trivial and ungainly.

44. One problem now remains for solution, my dear Terentianus, and knowing your love of learning I will not hesitate to append it—a problem which a certain philosopher recently put to me. "It surprises me," he said, "as it doubtless surprises many others too, how it is that in this age of ours we find natures that are supremely persuasive and suited for public life, shrewd and versatile and especially rich in literary charm, yet really sublime and tran-

[a] *Memorabilia* 1.4.6.

---

[2] περιηθήματα Pearce, for περιθήματα.
[3] ἐπ' εἴδους Toll, for ἐπιδοὺς.
[4] ἐπιπροσθεῖναι Manutius for ἐπιπροσθῆναι.
[5] <καὶ> add. K marg., Manutius.
[6] πρὸς <ἐμὲ> ἔναγχος Cobet, for προσέναγχος.

ὑπερμεγέθεις, πλὴν εἰ μή τι σπάνιον, οὐκέτι γεννῶνται φύσεις. τοσαύτη λόγων κοσμική τις ἐπέχει τὸν
2 βίον ἀφορία. ἦ νὴ Δί'" ἔφη "πιστευτέον ἐκείνῳ τῷ θρυλουμένῳ, ὡς ἡ δημοκρατία τῶν μεγάλων ἀγαθὴ τιθηνός, ᾗ μόνῃ σχεδὸν καὶ συνήκμασαν οἱ περὶ λόγους δεινοὶ καὶ συναπέθανον; θρέψαι τε γάρ, φασίν, ἱκανὴ τὰ φρονήματα τῶν μεγαλοφρόνων ἡ ἐλευθερία καὶ ἐπελπίσαι καὶ ἅμα διεγείρειν[1] τὸ πρόθυμον τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔριδος καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ
3 πρωτεῖα φιλοτιμίας. ἔτι γε μὴν διὰ τὰ προκείμενα ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις ἔπαθλα ἑκάστοτε τὰ ψυχικὰ προτερήματα τῶν ῥητόρων μελετώμενα ἀκονᾶται καὶ οἷον ἐκτρίβεται καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἐλεύθερα συνεκλάμπει. οἱ δὲ νῦν ἐοίκαμεν" ἔφη "παιδόμαθεῖς εἶναι δουλείας δικαίας, τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔθεσι καὶ ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐξ ἁπαλῶν ἔτι φρονημάτων μόνον οὐκ ἐνεσπαργανωμένοι καὶ ἄγευστοι καλλίστου καὶ γονιμωτάτου λόγων νάματος, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν" ἔφη "λέγω, διόπερ οὐδὲν ὅτι μὴ κόλακες ἐκ-
4 βαίνομεν μεγαλοφυεῖς." διὰ τοῦτο τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἕξεις καὶ εἰς οἰκέτας πίπτειν ἔφασκεν, δοῦλον δὲ μηδένα γίνεσθαι ῥήτορα· εὐθὺς γὰρ ἀναζεῖν[2] τὸ ἀπαρρησίαστον καὶ οἷον ἔμφρουρον ὑπὸ συνηθείας ἀεὶ κεκονδυλισμένον· "ἥμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς" κατὰ τὸν
5 Ὅμηρον "ἀποαίνυται δούλιον ἦμαρ." "ὥσπερ οὖν, εἴ γε" φησί "τοῦτο πιστόν ἐστιν <ὃ>[3] ἀκούω, τὰ

[1] Morus, for διελθεῖν.
[2] ἀναζεῖν Weiske, for ἀναζεῖ.

scendent natures are no longer, or only very rarely, now produced. Such is the universal dearth of literature that besets our times. Are we really to believe the hackneyed view that democracy is the kindly nurse of genius and that—speaking generally—the great men of letters flourished only with democracy and perished with it? Freedom, they say, has the power to foster noble minds and to fill them with high hopes, and at the same time to rouse our spirit of mutual rivalry and eager competition for the foremost place. Moreover, thanks to the prizes which a republic offers, an orator's intellectual gifts are whetted by practice, burnished, so to speak, by friction, and share, as is only natural, the light of freedom which illuminates the state. But in these days we seem to be schooled from childhood in an equitable slavery, swaddled, I might say, from the tender infancy of our minds in the same servile ways and practices. We never drink from the fairest and most fertile source of eloquence, which is freedom, and therefore we turn out to be nothing but flatterers on a grand scale." This is the reason, he alleged, that, while all other faculties are granted even to slaves, no slave ever becomes an orator. According to him, the inability to speak freely, and the sense of being as it were in prison, immediately assert themselves, the product of the repeated beating of habit. As Homer says: "Surely half of our manhood is robbed by the day of enslavement."[a] "And so," he adds, "if what I hear is true that not only do the

[a] *Odyssey* 17.322.

---

[3] <ô> add. Pearce.

γλωττόκομα, ἐν οἷς οἱ πυγμαῖοι, καλούμενοι δὲ νᾶνοι, τρέφονται, οὐ μόνον κωλύει τῶν ἐγκεκλεσμένων τὰς αὐξήσεις ἀλλὰ καὶ συναραιοῖ[1] διὰ τὸν περικείμενον τοῖς σώμασι δεσμόν, οὕτως ἅπασαν δουλείαν, κἂν ᾖ δικαιοτάτη, ψυχῆς γλωττόκομον καὶ
6 κοινὸν ἄν τις ἀποφήναιτο δεσμωτήριον." ἐγὼ μέντοι γε ὑπολαβών[2] "ῥᾴδιον," ἔφην "ὦ βέλτιστε, καὶ ἴδιον ἀνθρώπου τὸ καταμέμφεσθαι τὰ ἀεὶ παρόντα· ὅρα δὲ μή ποτε οὐχ ἡ τῆς οἰκουμένης εἰρήνη διαφθείρει τὰς μεγάλας φύσεις, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ κατέχων ἡμῶν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπεριόριστος οὑτοσὶ πόλεμος, καὶ νὴ Δία πρὸς τούτῳ τὰ φρουροῦντα τὸν νῦν βίον καὶ κατ' ἄκρας ἄγοντα καὶ φέροντα ταυτὶ πάθη. ἡ γὰρ φιλοχρηματία, πρὸς ἣν ἅπαντες ἁπλήστως ἤδη νοσοῦμεν, καὶ ἡ φιληδονία δουλαγωγοῦσι, μᾶλλον δέ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, καταβυθίζουσιν αὐτάνδρους ἤδη τοὺς βίους· φιλαργυρία μὲν <γὰρ>[3] νόσημα μικρο-
7 ποιόν, φιληδονία δ' ἀγεννέστατον. οὐ δὴ ἔχω λογιζόμενος εὑρεῖν, ὡς οἷόν τε πλοῦτον ἀόριστον ἐκτιμήσαντας, τὸ δ' ἀληθέστερον εἰπεῖν, ἐκθειάσαντας, τὰ συμφυῆ τούτῳ κακὰ εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐπεισιόντα μὴ παραδέχεσθαι. ἀκολουθεῖ γὰρ τῷ ἀμέτρῳ πλούτῳ καὶ ἀκολάστῳ συνημμένη καὶ ἴσα, φασί, βαίνουσα πολυτέλεια, καὶ ἅμα ἀνοίγοντος ἐκείνου τῶν πόλεων καὶ οἴκων τὰς εἰσόδους εὐθὺς[4] ἐμβαίνει καὶ συνοικίζεται. χρονίσαντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς βίοις

[1] *συναραιοῖ* Schmidt for *συνάροι*.

cages in which they keep the pygmies or dwarfs, as they are called, stunt the growth of their prisoners, but enfeeble them by the bonds applied to their bodies, on the same principle all slavery, however equitable, might well be described as a cage for the soul, a common prison." However I took him up and said, "It is easy, my good friend, and it is characteristic of human nature always to find fault with things as they are at the moment. But consider. Perhaps it is not the world's peace that corrupts great natures but much rather this endless warfare which besets our hearts, yes, and these passions that garrison our lives in present days and make utter havoc of them. It is the love of money, that insatiable sickness from which we all now suffer, and the love of pleasure, that enslave us, or rather one might say, sink our ship of life with all hands; for love of gold is a withering sickness, and love of pleasure utterly ignoble. Indeed, I cannot discover on consideration how, if we value boundless wealth, or to speak more truly, make a god of it, we can possibly keep our minds safe from the intrusion of the evils that accompany it. In close company with vast and unconscionable Wealth there follows, 'step for step,' as they say,[a] Extravagance: and no sooner has the one opened the gates of cities or houses, than the other comes and makes a home there too. And when they have spent some time in our

[a] Cf. Demosthenes, *Oration* 19.314.

---

[2] ὑπολαβών Bühler, for ὑπολαμβάνω.
[3] <γὰρ> add. Spengel.
[4] εὐθὺς Mathews, for εἰς ἃς.

νεοττοποιεῖται κατὰ τοὺς σοφοὺς καὶ ταχέως γενόμενα περὶ τεκνοποιΐαν ἀλαζόνειάν τε γεννῶσι καὶ τῦφον καὶ τρυφήν, οὐ νόθα ἑαυτῶν γεννήματα ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ γνήσια. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τούτους τις τοῦ πλούτου τοὺς ἐκγόνους εἰς ἡλικίαν ἐλθεῖν ἐάσῃ, ταχέως δεσπότας ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐντίκτουσιν ἀπαραιτήτους,
8 ὕβριν καὶ παρανομίαν καὶ ἀναισχυντίαν. ταῦτα γὰρ οὕτως ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι καὶ μηκέτι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναβλέπειν μηδ' ὑστεροφημίας[1] τελεσιουργεῖσθαι κατ' ὀλίγον τὴν τῶν βίων διαφθοράν, φθίνειν δὲ καὶ καταμαραίνεσθαι τὰ ψυχικὰ μεγέθη καὶ ἄζηλα γίνεσθαι, ἡνίκα τὰ θνητὰ ἑαυτῶν μέρη καὶ ἀνόητα[2] ἐκ-
9 θαυμάζοιεν, παρέντες αὔξειν τἀθάνατα. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ κρίσει μέν τις δεκασθεὶς οὐκ ἂν ἔτι τῶν δικαίων καὶ καλῶν ἐλεύθερος καὶ ὑγιὴς ἂν κριτὴς γένοιτο (ἀνάγκη γὰρ τῷ δωροδόκῳ τὰ οἰκεῖα μὲν φαίνεσθαι καλὰ καὶ δίκαια[3]), ὅπου δὲ ἡμῶν ἑκάστου τοὺς ὅλους ἤδη βίους δεκασμοὶ βραβεύουσι καὶ ἀλλοτρίων θῆραι θανάτων καὶ ἐνέδραι διαθηκῶν, τὸ δ' ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς κερδαίνειν ὠνούμεθα τῆς ψυχῆς ἕκαστος πρὸς τῆς <φιλοχρηματίας>[4] ἠνδραποδισμένοι, ἆρα δὴ ἐν τῇ τοσαύτῃ λοιμικῇ τοῦ βίου διαφθορᾷ δοκοῦμεν ἔτι ἐλεύθερόν τινα κριτὴν τῶν μεγάλων ἢ διηκόντων πρὸς τὸν αἰῶνα κἀδέκαστον[5] ἀπολελεῖφθαι καὶ μὴ καταρχαιρεσιάζεσθαι πρὸς τῆς τοῦ πλεονε-
10 κτεῖν ἐπιθυμίας; ἀλλὰ μήποτε τοιούτοις, οἷοί περ

[1] μηδ' ὑστεροφημίας Reiske, for μηδ' ἕτερα φήμης.

lives, philosophers tell us, they build a nest there[a] and promptly set about begetting children; these are Swagger and Conceit and Luxury, no bastards but their trueborn issue. And if these offspring of wealth are allowed to grow to maturity, they soon breed in our hearts inexorable tyrants, Insolence and Disorder and Shamelessness. This must inevitably happen, and men no longer then look upwards nor take any further thought for future fame. Little by little the ruin of their lives is completed in the cycle of such vices, their greatness of soul wastes away and dies and is no longer something to strive for, since they value that part of them which is mortal and foolish, and neglect the development of their immortal part. A man who has been bribed for his verdict can no longer give an unbiased and sound judgement on what is just and fair (for the corrupt judge inevitably regards his own interest as fair and just). So, seeing that the whole life of each one of us is now governed wholly by bribery and by hunting after other people's deaths and laying traps for legacies, and we have sold our souls for profit at any price, slaves that we all are to our greed, can we then expect in such pestilential ruin of our lives that there is left a single free and unbribed judge of the things that are great and last to all eternity? Are we not all corrupted by our passion for gain? Nay, for such as we are perhaps it is better

[a] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 9.573C.

---

[2] *καὶ ἀνόητα* Toup, for *καπανητα*.

[3] Spengel, with reason, suspected a lacuna here: the sense of the missing words would be "but other people's interests improper." [4] *<φιλοχρηματίας>* add. Toll.

[5] *κἀδέκαστου* Toll, for *καθέκαστον*

ἐσμὲν ἡμεῖς, ἄμεινον ἄρχεσθαι ἢ ἐλευθέροις εἶναι· ἐπείτοιγε ἀφεθεῖσαι τὸ σύνολον, ὡς ἐξ εἱρκτῆς ἄφετοι, κατὰ τῶν πλησίον αἱ πλεονεξίαι κἂν ἐπικλύσειαν[1] τοῖς κακοῖς τὴν οἰκουμένην. ὅλως δὲ δάπανον[2] ἔφην εἶναι τῶν νῦν γεννωμένων φύσεων τὴν ῥᾳθυμίαν, ᾗ πλὴν ὀλίγων πάντες ἐγκαταβιοῦμεν, οὐκ ἄλλως πονοῦντες ἢ ἀναλαμβάνοντες εἰ μὴ ἐπαίνου καὶ ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα, ἀλλὰ μὴ τῆς ζήλου καὶ τιμῆς ἀξίας ποτὲ ὠφελείας." "κράτιστον εἰκῇ ταῦτ' ἐᾶν," ἐπὶ δὲ τὰ συνεχῆ χωρεῖν· ἦν δὲ ταῦτα τὰ πάθη, περὶ ὧν ἐν ἰδίῳ προηγουμένως ὑπεσχόμεθα γράψειν ὑπομνήματι, ἅτε[3] τήν τε τοῦ ἄλλου λόγου καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὕψους μοῖραν ἐπεχόντων, ὡς ἡμῖν. . . .[4]

11

12

[1] ἐπικλύσειαν Markland, for ἐπικαύσειαν

[2] δάπανον Toll, for δαπανῶν

[3] ἅτε Mazzucchi for ὃ.

[4] The next few words can only be guessed; perhaps εἴρηται, κρατίστην . . .